

THEOLOGY

A Monthly Journal of Historic Christianity

Edited by the Rev. E. G. SELWYN, D.D., REDHILL RECTORY, HAVANT,
to whom all editorial matters should be addressed.

Vol. XVIII

APRIL, 1929

No. 106

EDITORIAL

THE Easter season now opening will draw the attention of many minds to the problem of the relation of the risen and ascended Lord to the Holy Spirit. Of each it is taught in the New Testament that He is in us and we in Him; and some have therefore jumped to the conclusion that St. Paul drew no real distinction between these two Persons of the Blessed Trinity. Far the most penetrating treatment of the issue which we know will be found in a book already alluded to in these notes, Father Thornton's *The Incarnate Lord* (chaps. vii. and xii.). Starting from the reminder—greatly needed today, when innovation of any kind is supposed to be the hall-mark of the Spirit—that “the new life in the Spirit is rooted in the experience of the cross,” Father Thornton goes on to urge that in the New Testament writings “the Spirit is regarded as the creative source of the new life and its endowments; whereas Christ is both object of experience and content of the new life.” We can do no more now than refer our readers to Father Thornton's whole discussion, only adding the expression of our own conviction that it is along these lines that the study of the doctrine of the Holy Spirit must develop. And, further, a caution perhaps is needed: we must not be disappointed if theology finds itself often baffled in this field. For the work of the Holy Spirit is on this view hidden, and behind rather than in front of the soul's experience and thought. He bears witness, not to Himself, but to Christ; and it is in the illumination of our Lord's Sacred Humanity, and the formation of it in the believer, that we shall find the clearest marks of His Presence.

PERSONAL IDENTITY AND THE RESURRECTION OF THE BODY

THE question what in the ordinary sense constitutes identity as applied to living organisms is one which must be considered by all philosophical systems, but seems to be rarely discussed in its more commonplace aspects apart from metaphysical considerations. Why do we say that this or that person or animal or tree is the same as it was yesterday or ten years ago?

Clearly as regards persons, the first point is usually outward appearance; we recognize a friend by his face, his form, the colour of his eyes or hair, or, if these have been much altered from the lapse of time, very probably by the voice or some peculiarity of gait or gesture. In the first case it is the continuity of structure, in the second the continuity of function which determines us. We often recognize the fact of the material change which has taken place, but that does not alter our belief as to the identity of the individual. In neither case do we appeal to the identity of the material substratum underlying both form and function, probably because we assume, quite inaccurately, that it does remain the same.

The same reasoning applies, *mutatis mutandis*, to all forms of organic life—*e.g.*, Butler's instance of the tree quoted later. The form and growth of the tree are what determine our verdict as to its identity without reference to any supposed identity of its substance. It is due to a misapprehension of what individual identity (to use a wider phrase covering all organic life) really means that much that is misleading has been written about the resurrection of the body.

In discussing the question of the material resurrection, the Bishop of Birmingham* says that "the idea of a resurrection of the flesh could only be entertained so long as the truths of chemistry were unknown, because the molecules of our flesh are used again and again by living creatures, they enter the bodies of other human beings."† Without entering into any of the theological problems involved, it may be said at once that whilst the statement is undoubtedly true, the argument is, from a scientific point of view, beside the mark, and for this reason—viz., that the identity of the body does not depend on the identity of the material particles of which at any given moment it is composed, but, as stated, on the continuity of

* *Should such a Faith Offend?* pp. 88 et seq.

† This difficulty was, in fact, realized and discussed by that eminent scientist Robert Boyle in a paper entitled *Physical Considerations on the Resurrection* about 1670. His arguments are very ingenious and interesting; modern scientific discoveries have in no wise altered the problem.

structure and functions which it manifests. The physical history of the body, and of all living organisms, is, as the Bishop recognizes, one of ceaseless and unending change; every physical and mental activity entails waste from cellular activity, and that waste is made good in the normal body by the supply of fresh material. The body is not, materially considered, the same from hour to hour, still less from year to year. It is certain that a large portion of the body consists, after a few years, of totally different material; it is even possible that, within a certain period, it may be completely renewed. Yet we should not dream of speaking or thinking of the individual as other than the same who existed some years ago. In other words, the actual material is of no account as long as it is capable of being fashioned to the needs of the individual body.

If, for the purposes of argument, we assume that an omniscient and omnipotent creator was reconstructing an individual human body, it would be a matter of complete indifference what individual atoms or molecules he employed, so long as they were of equivalent values and the result was identity in structure and functions with the body previously existing. *Ex hypothesi*, the personality of that body would be the same as in its previous existence, and would inform the body in the same way. Whatever other difficulties, therefore (and they are grave enough), the doctrine of the resurrection of the body may present to the scientific mind, this particular one does not exist.*

It is quite true that Christians, both lay and clerical, believed in varying degree in an actual material resurrection of the body, but it is quite incorrect to suppose that the more intelligent did not recognize the difficulties that beset that doctrine.

Thus Dr. Thomas Browne in *Religio Medici* says:

"How shall the dead arise, is no question of my Faith; to believe only possibilities is not Faith, but mere Philosophy. . . . I believe that our estranged and divided ashes shall unite again; that our separated dust, after so many pilgrimages and transformations into the parts of minerals, plants, animals, elements, shall at the Voice of God return into their primitive shapes, and join again to make up their primary and predestinate forms. As at the Creation there was a separation of that confused mass into its species; so at the destruction thereof there shall be a separation

* What is certain is that the more active parts of the body—the brain, the heart, the lungs, and the alimentary organs—must be undergoing incessant change, as their activities never end, though they vary in intensity. After a few years all these organs must be replaced by new tissue and, in fact, be new. The skin itself is constantly renovated; considerable portions of it are shed daily. The parts which only change very slowly, and perhaps, when once fully formed, only partially, are the bony structures and the connective tissues—i.e., those which, whilst they are essential in determining the form and structure of the body, take the smallest share in its functional activities.

into its distinct individuals. As at the Creation of the world, all the distinct species that we behold lay involved in one mass, till the fruitful Voice of God separated this united multitude into its several species; so at the last day, when those corrupted reliques shall be scattered in the wilderness of forms, and seem to have forgot their proper habits, God by a powerful Voice shall command them back into their proper shapes, and call them out by their single individuals."

In this connection we may also compare a passage quoted by Dr. Liddon in a sermon on Immortality* from South's Sermon on the General Resurrection:†

"And therefore the opinion of the Socinians, namely, that the soul, at the resurrection, shall be clothed with another and quite different body, from what it had in this life (whether of ether or some such like sublimated matter), moved thereto by the aforementioned objections, and the like, ought not to be admitted: it being contrary to reason and all sound philosophy, that the soul, successively united to two entirely distinct bodies, should make but one and the same numerical person: since, though the soul be indeed the prime and chief principle of the individuation of the person, yet it is not the sole and adequate principle thereof; but the soul, joined with the body, makes the adequate individuating principle of the person. Nor will any true philosophy allow, that the body was ever intended for the mere garment of the soul, but for an essential, constituent part of the man, as really as the soul itself: and the difference of an essential half in any composition will be sure to make an essential difference in the whole compound. Nor is this Socinian assertion more contrary to the principles of philosophy than to the express words of Scripture, which are not more positive in affirming a resurrection than in declaring a resurrection of the same numerical person. And whereas they say that they grant that the same numerical person shall rise again, though not the same body (the soul, as they contend, still individuating any body which it shall be clothed with), we have already shown, on the contrary, that the person cannot be numerically the same, when the body is not so too; since the soul is not the sole principle of personal individuation, though the chief."

To this may be added the conclusion of Dr. Liddon's own sermon, which seems to assert clearly a resurrection of the flesh, though transfigured.

"The Christian faith bids us look forward to a resurrection of that very body which has been throughout our earthly life the instrument, the dwelling-house, perchance the faithful transcript of the personal soul within it. And the risen body, transfigured, translucent with spiritual glory, will still assert in the courts of heaven the deathless endurance of our personality in its unimpaired completeness."

Browne fully recognizes that the material particles of the body go through many changes and pass through other animal

* University Sermons, First Series, 1881.

† Vol. i., p. 360, ed. Bohn, 1855.

bodies, but his mystical mind ignores the real difficulties—viz., that unless it is supposed that it is always the body as it existed at the moment of death which is raised again, the incessant changes make it impossible to say which is the individual's real body, that of six months ago or that of today, of which perhaps more than half has undergone complete change. That is the real and insuperable difficulty in the literal doctrine of the resurrection of the body which the older writers never faced, even though they recognized the facts. It is certain that the material of the greater part of the body has been changed many times in the course of a man's lifetime, so that the very difficulty which South thought he could avoid by a literal interpretation of the doctrine of the Resurrection—viz., that the soul would have to inhabit two bodies—becomes a much greater menace.

It is interesting to compare the way in which this question was treated by Bishop Butler in his dissertation "Of Personal Identity," which was intended to be part of his chapter "Of a Future Life." He enquires why a tree which has stood in one place for fifty years is called the same tree, but he does not allow that the word "same" as applied to the tree and to a person has the same meaning. The whole passage is worth quoting as illustrating at once the writer's insight and the limitations which the thought of his age imposed on him.

"The enquiry what makes a vegetable the same in the common acceptance of the word does not appear to have any relation to this of personal identity: because the word same when applied to them and to persons is not only applied to different subjects, but it is also used in different senses. For when a man swears to the same tree as having stood fifty years in the same place, he means only the same as to all the purposes of property and uses of common life, and not that the tree has been all the time the same in the strict philosophical sense of the word. For he does not know whether any one particle of the present tree be the same with any one particle of the tree which stood in the same place fifty years ago. And if they have not one common particle of matter, they cannot be the same tree in the proper philosophic sense of the word same: it being evidently a contradiction in terms to say they are, when no part of their substance and no part of their properties is the same: no part of their substance by the supposition: no one of their properties because it is allowed that the same property cannot be transferred from one substance to another. And therefore when we say the identity or the sameness of a plant consists in a continuation of the same life, communicated under the same organization to a number of particles of matter, whether the same or not; the word same, when applied to life and to organization, cannot possibly be understood to signify, what it signifies in this very sentence, when applied to matter. In a loose and popular sense, then, the life and the organization and the plant are justly said to be the same, notwithstanding the perpetual change of the parts. But in a strict and

philosophical manner of speech, no man, no mode of being, no anything can be the same with that with which it has indeed nothing the same. Now sameness is used in this latter sense when applied to persons. The identity of these therefore cannot subsist with diversity of substance."

In this passage Butler is quite alive to the constant change going on in organic nature, and sees the impossibility of maintaining the doctrine of the continuous material identity of living things. But he was debarred by the remnants of the old Scholastic philosophy, which he accepted, from arriving at the truth. "It is allowed," he says, "that the same property cannot be transferred from one substance to another." Properties to him were not something intimately correlated with and deriving from the nature and structure of a substance, but entities superadded to that substance. He was therefore unable to conceive that the real explanation of the continuous identity of living organisms, physically considered, lies in the continuity of structure and functions, due to the constant renovation and adaptation of the material substratum.

Failing this, both he and Boyle, while clinging to such a conception of a fleshly resurrection as St. Paul's words at least never justified, are unable to solve the problem of identity satisfactorily.

But in the following passage Boyle recognizes his failure, and gets nearer the truth than either divine.*

"Since these things are so, why should it be impossible that a most intelligent agent, whose omnipotence extends to all that is not truly contradictory to the nature of things, or to his own, should be able so to order and watch the particles of a human body, that of those remaining in the bones, of those that plentifully fly away by insensible transpiration and of those that are otherwise disposed of upon their resolution, a competent number may be preserved or retrieved; so that, stripping them of their disguises, or extricating them from other parts of matter, to which they may happen to be conjoin'd, he may reunite them betwixt themselves, and, if need be, with particles of matter fit to be interwoven with them, and thereby restore or reproduce a body which, being united with the former soul, may, in a sense agreeable to the expressions of Scripture, recompose the same man, whose soul and body were formerly disjoin'd by death?"

"Hitherto we have taken the doctrine of the resurrection in a more strict and literal sense because I would show that even according to that the difficulties of answering what is mentioned against the possibility of it are not insuperable; tho' it would much facilitate the defence and explanation of so abstruse a thing to allow, that as the human soul is the form of man; so that whatever duly organized portion of matter is thereto united; it therewith constitutes the same man; the import of the resurrec-

* Boyle, vol. ii., p. 177, ed. 1725.

tion is fulfilled in this that after death . . . the soul shall . . . be again united . . . to such a substance as may with tolerable propriety of speech be called a human body."

It seems probable that in this last phrase Boyle had in view those words of St. Paul which indicate clearly the difference between the nature of the mortal and that of the immortal body. The latter is spiritual and incorruptible, therefore the substance of which it consists must differ in some kind from that which we know as flesh; matter raised to a higher power, we may call it, but giving the semblance of the individual as he was known in this life. It is, in truth, difficult to understand how anyone who accepted St. Paul's teaching could ever suppose it to mean that the risen body was to be of the same kind of flesh as we here possess. He says explicitly: "Flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God," neither can corruption inherit incorruption. The contrast of corruption and incorruption alone renders any such interpretation inconceivable.

That such a view is in no sense held by the orthodox Christian of today is briefly but clearly shown by Bishop Gore (*The Religion of the Church*, p. 85, 1916).

To sum up briefly, continuous personal identity, so far as the material of the body is concerned, is, in what Butler calls the strict philosophic sense, non-existent; the true tests of such continuity are the structure and function of the organism.

Any supposed difficulty as to the necessity of re-collecting the earthly remains in order to effect the resurrection of the body thereby disappears entirely.

But the chief exponent of the Resurrection doctrine in the New Testament does not suggest that the material body is raised.

On the contrary, St. Paul takes great pains to emphasize the complete metamorphosis of the earthly body into something spiritual and incorruptible, and it is here that scientific difficulty begins. It is impossible to conceive of any body in our human sense which is not liable to corruption. But the difficulty is at least no greater than that of forming any actual conception of disembodied spirit unconditioned by the flesh. From whatever angle within the orbit of Christian thought the enquirer approaches this question, he has to recognize that he is here face to face with that mystery which St. Paul indicates but does not attempt to explain.

The older writers saw the difficulties, some of them very clearly, as the extracts show, but did not grapple, for the most part, with them, probably because tradition based on an ill-founded exegesis led them to take even St. Paul's words as

standing for a resurrection of the flesh. It has been shown that these words are such as cannot possibly be applied to a body whose substance is corruptible and in this life undergoing incessant change. We have really no alternative but to suppose that there exists from this point of view a certain dualism of the body, not a dualism of body and spirit, but of the body in its two aspects, natural and spiritual. The dead body undergoes the changes of death and decay as when living it underwent the changes of growth and disease. The material particles which constitute the body at the moment of death are no more "ourselves" than those which were part of us six months or six years before: they are merely performing temporarily the same function that during the life of the individual countless myriads of other atoms have performed before, and like them are destined to pass back, in some form or other, into the general stock of what we call matter in the universe.

From a dualism in this sense there is no logical escape; what the power is behind the ever-changing vestment of material particles which makes a unity of the shifting mass by individualizing and moulding each cell is the real mystery of life.

It is possible that we might link this up with Dr. McNeile's idea of the "morphe"* (*The Problem of the Future Life*, p. 110) as being the germ of the spiritual body. It is not possible to conceive of such a principle being present in the physical body and not influencing its elements. Our common experience does, in fact, teach us that the inner life of man moulds his outward characteristics, so that, to take extreme cases, we are often conscious that we are in the presence of a saint or a villain. But in the last resort we have to admit that any attempt to define this more closely is purely speculative, and that we have little to guide us as to the exact connection between, or the transition from, the natural to the spiritual body.

Of the latter we know nothing save what we may deduce as applicable from the accounts of the body of the risen Christ. We have reached a point where, as Bishop Gore remarks, a large element of agnosticism seems to belong to our deepest wisdom. We are outside the region of revelation, and even more outside the sphere of scientific speculation, which can only deal

* The word "morphe" is not a very happy one, as it connotes externality and is specially used by Plato in contrast to the "eidos," or inner form. Nor is it well applicable to the essentially dynamic conception of that which is present "germinally and potentially." It is not easy to suggest a substitute, unless indeed the word "eidos" be used for the inner form and "morphe" reserved for the completed spiritual body. In attempting to formulate a conception which is not really defined in St. Paul's Epistle, but is in fact the mystery which he speaks of (1 Cor. xv. 51), it is some advantage to have a word which carries no implication from other usage in the Epistles.

with bodies that obey the physical laws as we know them. As to the universal validity of those physical laws themselves science is in grave doubt since its foundations were set gently rocking by the earthquake wave of relativity. Even the elect few who can fully follow the course of present researches openly waver as to whither they will ultimately lead them. But it is at least clear that science itself is being led far away from a purely deterministic materialism, very probably to developments hitherto quite unforeseen.

E. HOBHOUSE.

THE APPEARANCE OF JESUS TO ST. JAMES

PRELIMINARY

THIS Gospel is quoted as an authority by Origen, St. Jerome, St. Clement of Alexandria, and many others of the early Christian writers. Mr. Baring Gould says,* before giving a list of about twenty quotations from that Gospel: "It is necessary to observe, as preliminary to our quotations, that the early Fathers cited passages from the Gospel without the smallest prejudice against it either historically or doctrinally. They do not seem to have considered it apocryphal, as open to suspicion, either because it contained doctrine at variance with the canonical Greek Gospels, or because it narrated circumstances not found in them. On the contrary, they refer to it as a good, trustworthy authority for the facts of our Lord's life, and for the doctrines He taught." It does not seem, however, to have been generally regarded as "canonical," though used and read by the Nazarenes. It will be noticed, however, that the passage relating to the manifestation of our Lord to St. James quoted below is vouched for by Jerome himself as being in this Gospel.

Mr. E. B. Nicholson, in his work on this Gospel, advances the theory or hypothesis "that Matthew wrote *at different times* the canonical Gospel and the Gospel according to the Hebrews, or at least that large part of the latter which runs parallel to the former."† But this view is not generally accepted.

* *Lost and Hostile Gospels*, by Rev. S. Baring Gould, M.A. (1874), p. 128. Bishop Westcott, in his *Introduction to the Study of the Gospels*, gives seventeen fragments; both these writers add a number of passages, which they think may belong to this Gospel. Mr. E. B. Nicholson in his very learned work, *The Gospel according to the Hebrews* (C. Kegan Paul, 1879), gives thirty-three, including some doubtful ones; and Dr. Dunkerley in the *Expository Times* of July and August, 1928, cites fifteen of the fragments which he considers the more important.

† Page 104.

Harnack and Zahn think it independent of our canonical Gospels. Of the high antiquity of this Gospel there can be no doubt. It was almost certainly written before the close of the first century, and most modern commentators think it contains fragments of historical traditions and teaching of Jesus: and that some at least of them are genuine.

It is not necessary to quote the whole of the passages from the Gospel which are still extant, especially as they have been set out in the *Hibbert Journal* of October, 1904, in an article by Dr. Adeney, and by the other writers mentioned above; but it may be said generally that it resembles the Gospel of St. Matthew. It gives a detailed account of the Baptism of Jesus,* and tells us that the man with the withered hand† was a mason, and quotes us the words in which he makes his appeal to Jesus. It also gives a long narrative of a rich man who asked: "Master, what good thing shall I do to live?"‡ And it tells us that a lintel of the temple of vast size was broken at the death of Jesus.§

It obviously had accounts of the Last Supper, of the Crucifixion, and of the Resurrection. As it seems to follow St. Matthew, it probably contained an account of the appearance of Jesus to St. Mary Magdalen; but the only accounts of appearances after the Resurrection which are found in those fragments of the Gospel which we possess are those to the twelve Apostles, to the priest's servant, and to James the Just. The first one is given by Bishop Westcott as follows:||

"When the Lord came to Peter and the Apostles (after His Resurrection) He said to them, Take, hold, handle Me, and see that I am not an incorporeal spirit. And straightway they touched Him and believed, being convinced by His flesh and by His Spirit."¶

THE APPEARANCE TO ST. JAMES

As to the two others which are the subject of this paper, I take the text from Westcott's *Introduction to the Study of the Gospels* (p. 463) and append a translation which mainly follows the one he gives:

Hieron. de Virr. Illustr. II.: Evangelium quoque quod appellatur secundum Hebraeos, et a me nuper in Graecum Latinumque sermonem

* The passages in this Gospel are quoted below, pages 17, 18.

† Jerome ad. Matt. xii.; Bishop Westcott (edit. 1874), pp. 464-465.

‡ Origen's Commentary on Matt. xix. (Latin translation). See Westcott, p. 463; Nicholson, 4, 5, 49.

§ Jerome ad. Matt. xxvii. 51; Westcott, p. 465; Nicholson, p. 62.

|| *Introduction to the Study of the Gospels* (edit. 1874).

¶ Ignatius ad. Smyrn., 3; "the same words are quoted by Jerome from the Nazarene Gospel, de Virr. Illustr. 16" (Westcott, 456 n.).

translatum est, quo et Origenes saepe utitur, post resurrectionem Salvatoris refert: Dominus autem cum dedisset sindonem servo sacerdotis, ivit ad Jacobum et apparuit ei. Juraverat enim Jacobus se non comesturum panem ab illa hora qua biberat calicem Domini, donec videret eum resurgentem a dormientibus (Gr. Anastanta ek nekrōn). Rursusque post paullulum: Afferte, ait Dominus, mensam et panem. Statimque additur: Tulit panem et benedixit ac fregit et dedit Jacobo justo, et dixit ei; Frater mi, comede panem tuum, quia resurrexit Filius hominis a dormientibus.

[The Gospel entitled *according to the Hebrews*, which I lately translated into Greek and Latin, and which Origen often quotes, contained the following narrative after the Resurrection:

"Now the Lord, when He had given the cloth (sindon)* to the servant of the priest, went to James and appeared to him. For James had taken an oath that he would not eat bread from that hour on which he had drunk the cup of the Lord till he saw Him risen† from them that sleep. Again a little afterwards the Lord says, Bring ye a table and bread. Immediately it is added, He took bread, and blessed, and brake, and gave it to James the Just, and said to him, My brother, eat thy bread, for the Son of Man has risen‡ from them that sleep.]

This remarkable statement contains four members—viz.: (1) the appearance to the priest's servant; (2) James' oath; (3) the appearance to James; (4) the order for the table, and the blessing of the bread and gift of it to James.

Let us for the moment *assume* that this narrative is a true one, and see how it corresponds with the information we have from the canonical Gospels; and for the moment let us postpone consideration of the appearance to the priest's servant.

It is quite certain that James did *not* drink "the cup of the Lord" at the Last Supper, which took place on the "same night that Jesus was betrayed"; for this James—James the Just—was not present. He was neither one of the Twelve, nor a disciple, nor even a believer.§ We know, however, that he became a believer,|| and ultimately Bishop of Jerusalem, and that he wrote the Epistle which bears his name.

St. Paul tells us the bare fact that Jesus appeared to James;¶ and this Gospel gives us some striking additions as to the manner and circumstances of this appearance. So that to this extent St. Paul and the Gospel support each other. At the same time this Hebrew Gospel's story upon the face of it

* This word "sindon," which Westcott translates "cloth," Nicholson translates "linen cloth." Perhaps "linen garment" would be the best rendering; see below, page 195.

† So Westcott translates the word. Nicholson (p. 66) gives "rising again"; and Baring Gould (p. 148) "rising."

‡ Westcott here translates "has risen"; both Nicholson and Baring Gould have "is risen."

§ John vii. 5.

|| Acts i. 14.

¶ 1 Cor. xv. 7.

looks hopelessly untrue, and merely a weird and extraordinary legend, so long as it is supposed to contain the obvious misstatement that James the Just was present at the Last Supper and that the appearance to St. James was on Easter Day, which latter statement is a direct contradiction to St. Paul. It is also incredible because it is supposed to say that the "sindon" which Jesus gave to the priest's servant was a burial napkin. And this makes the whole story unintelligible and unworthy of belief;* and, moreover, is in conflict with St. John's† and the other Gospels.

This difficulty is entirely removed if we accept St. Paul's statement that the appearance to St. James took place long after Easter Day, and was one of the latest of the appearances; and suppose that St. James, instead of taking his oath at the Last Supper (where he was not present), took it at some subsequent celebration previous to the Ascension.

For there can be no doubt that the disciples would not delay to obey their Lord's dying request; moreover, our Saviour had given them an implied promise that He would drink wine new with them in His kingdom, and the evidence given in the Acts supports this view. It is quite possible that the disciples met on Easter Sunday evening for the express purpose of making, for the first time, the Perpetual Memorial.

The Speaker's Commentary remarks that the Church may be said to have really commenced when the death of Christ fulfilled the typical meaning of the Jewish sacrifices and virtually abrogated them. "The periodical celebration of the Holy Eucharist commenced from that time, and it is probable, though not expressly stated, that our Lord, after the Resurrection, partook of it with His disciples. See Luke xxiv. 30; John xx. 19, 26; Acts x. 41, compared with the evidence of the Apostolic practice of celebrating the Holy Communion on every Lord's Day (Acts xx. 7)." (Speaker's Commentary on Matt. xxvi. 19: "I will not drink henceforth of the fruit of the vine, until that day when I drink it new with you in My Father's kingdom.") "New" here means, as the same commentary says, "new"

* In a recent article in the *Expository Times* (August, 1928, p. 493) Dr. Dunkerley, following Bishop Lightfoot, reads "from that hour wherein the Lord (Dominus) had drunk the cup," instead of "from that hour in which he (James) had drunk the cup of the Lord." In this case the "cup" would not be the cup of the Eucharist, but the cup of suffering which Jesus Himself drank at His crucifixion. This reading would do away with the difficulty that James was not present at the Last Supper; but it only has the authority of a very inaccurate Greek translation of Jerome, while all the known Latin MSS. have the reading which I have given in the text. See Nicholson, pp. 67-69, where he states additional reasons against the reading "Dominus." Moreover, even with this change the story is still in direct conflict with the account given by St. Paul as to the date of the appearance to James. Also giving the napkin to the priest's servant still remains a contradiction of the Gospels.

† xx. 7. See also page 195 below.

in quality or character . . . as referring to the new character given to the wine as an element in the Christian Sacrament.

It is somewhat startling to find a disciple of our Lord taking an oath, and such an oath as is here indicated; but it must be remembered that James had only recently become a disciple, probably less than a month before, and that he may never have heard of the Sermon on the Mount, nor of our Lord's refusal to leap from the pinnacle of the temple, nor of His reproof of those who sought after a sign. It is clear, also, that James was convinced that the Lord had risen from the dead. He would not have joined the disciples and partaken of the cup of the Lord had he not so believed. He had had the evidence of the Apostles as to at least two manifestations of Jesus on Easter Day and the Sunday after. In all probability he had the testimony of Thomas and of his own mother.* He had ample evidence for belief, and was willing to stake his life upon it; and the risk did not seem to him to be a great one. He was an earnest believer in the efficacy of prayer, as we see in his Epistle; and as we learn from other sources, he also had a similar belief as to fasting. Hegesippus tells us that he drank neither wine nor fermented liquors and abstained from animal food. Hegesippus† adds: "He used to enter the temple alone, and was often found upon his bended knees, interceding for the forgiveness of the people, so that his knees became as hard as camels' through his habitual supplication and kneeling before God."

He also relied, no doubt, upon the personal affection of his "brother," who would not be likely to leave him either to commit suicide or to the degrading humiliation of breaking his oath. This plan of swearing to abstain from food till something was done was not unusual.‡ The strangeness of the incident does not disprove its truth. The audacious statement of Thomas won its prize; and it may well be that James was encouraged to what seems to us awful rashness by the acceptance and success of a half-believer.§

The loving greeting, "My brother," is of the deepest interest not only as showing us that we need not fear that death destroys either earthly relationships or family affection, but as throwing light on the strong regard that Jesus had towards His brothers. This last is illustrated again by the narrative as to the Baptism in this same Gospel of the Hebrews which I quote below.

* Or aunt, if Jerome is correct; or step-mother, if the view of Epiphanius is right—at any rate, of a near relation with whom he was on most friendly terms.

† Eusebius, Book II., chap. xxiii.

‡ Acts xxiii. 4.

§ Another example of the success of boldness in striving with the Almighty is given by James' own remote ancestor in Gen. xxxii. 26.

It will be noticed that St. Jerome, after describing James' oath, indicates a short break in his citation from the Gospel. The Gospel evidently recorded something which happened after the appearance of the Lord and before His direction that the table should be brought. We can have no doubt that the Gospel here contained some cry of wonder or awe, and perhaps a word of penitence from James, and possibly some reply of mercy and love from the Redeemer.

The scene of the appearance to James was probably an upper chamber, bare and unfurnished, in which James was praying. There was no table in the room, but there were those near who could hear the Lord call for it, and one was soon available. Then followed what certainly seems to have been a celebration of the Lord's Supper. There is the Manual Action, the Blessing, the Fraction, and the Administration. All this could hardly have taken place, and would hardly have been so carefully recorded, if the sole and only object had been to provide a meal for a hungry man.

THE APPEARANCE TO THE PRIEST'S SERVANT

Now let us go back to our Lord's appearance to the priest's servant. This, I take it, had nothing whatever to do with the appearance to James except that it occurred shortly before that event. It seems to have been a distinct appearance to the priest's servant when engaged upon his ordinary domestic duties, with which the linen cloth (*sindon*) was obviously connected. It should be observed that it is not stated in the Gospel that the events related in the narrative occurred immediately after the Resurrection.

The "*sindon*" was probably handed to the servant as an assurance that it was no incorporeal spirit that he saw.

It is quite in accordance with the histories in the Bible that the appearance should take place to one who was engaged in his ordinary duties. Such was the case with the manifestation at the Sea of Galilee; and it is in accord with the Oxyrrhyncus saying, "Raise the stone and there thou shalt find me, cleave the wood and there I am."

The word Bishop Westcott translated simply as "cloth" is "*sindon*." It means cloth of linen or some other special substance. Some of the official garments or vestments of the priest are directed in Leviticus to be of linen (Lev. vi. 10). They were holy garments (*ibid.*, xvi. 4; compare 1 Chron. xv. 27). Nicholson translates it "linen cloth," and refers to the linen clothes in which Jesus was buried (Matt. xxvii. 59), where this same word "*sindon*" is used for the linen clothes.

It is also used in Mark xvi. 46, Luke xxvii. 53. St. John speaks of the linen clothes (xix. 40; xx. 5, 6, 7) and of "the napkin (soudarion) that was upon His head" (xx. 7), but does not use the word "sindon." In Mark xiv. 51, 52, we are told of a young man who had a "sindon" cast about him, and he left the sindon and fled away naked.

This is translated "linen cloth," and was evidently a garment, not merely a piece of cloth; and the word in the Gospel of the Hebrews' narrative may be an official linen garment of the priest, which his servant was preparing for use. This makes a perfectly possible, uncontradicted story; while the theory that it was a burial cloth or napkin is in direct conflict with all the four canonical Gospels.

The impossible story of the appearance to James on Easter Day is only made even more impossible by that of the appearance to the priest's servant on that day.

There is no impossibility in the appearances a few weeks later.

There is nothing improbable in a priest's servant being an early believer in the Resurrection of Jesus. Many of that class would know something of His teaching and of His promises of a Resurrection; and after that event some may even have received and believed statements made by those who had already seen the risen Lord.* Mr. Nicholson suggests that this refers to the servant of the High Priest named Malchus.† As he had seen Jesus in the Garden and had been healed by Him, he would be very likely to make further enquiry, and so be prepared to believe on Him.

The name of the High Priest's servant would hardly have been mentioned by the Evangelists unless in some way or other he was likely to be known to the readers of the Gospel. In any case, whether Malchus became a believer or not, his story of Gethsemane would be told to many of the priest's servants, and would have roused at least some to make further enquiries as to Jesus.

DATES OF THE APPEARANCES TO ST. JAMES AND THE PRIEST'S SERVANT

We are now in a position to consider the dates and places of the three events—viz., the appearances to the priest's servant and to James, and of the Lord's Supper at which the oath was

* Before the Crucifixion many of the rulers believed on Jesus (John xii. 42); and some time afterwards "a great company of the priests were obedient to the faith" (Acts vi. 7).

† Matt. xxv. 51; Mark xiv. 47; Luke xxii. 50; John xviii. 10. It is "the servant of the High Priest"; and St. John gives the name Malchus. See also John xviii. 15, 26.

taken. Probably they were all near together. The narrative seems to suggest that as to the appearances, and we may be quite sure that Jesus would not allow James to fast very long.

The oath could not have been taken on Easter or the following Sunday, as Jesus was present. After that Sunday the disciples went to Galilee.* The appearance to the priest's servant was probably at Jerusalem, so we may fairly assume that all three events took place in Jerusalem, and that the Lord's Supper, at which James took the oath, was celebrated on some Sunday after the Apostles returned to that city. And this agrees with the statement of St. Paul (1 Cor. xv. 7, 8), who places the appearance to St. James very near the end of his list.

Latham takes the view that it was a short time after He had showed Himself to the company on the Mount, and perhaps three weeks before the Ascension.† If, however, the appearance took place at Jerusalem, the fifth Sunday after Easter would be the more probable date.

THE BAPTISM OF JESUS

I will now quote the passages in the Gospel which relate to the Baptism of Jesus.

In the Gospel according to the Hebrews . . . there is the following passage: "So the mother of the Lord and His brethren said to Him: John the Baptist is baptizing for the remission of sins; let us go and be baptized by Him. But He said to them: What sin have I committed that I should go and be baptized by him? unless perchance this very word which I have spoken is (a sin of) ignorance."‡

This story—if true—is full of interest as indicating the deep and tender regard Jesus had for his mother and brothers.

There is, first, His refusal, or at least hesitation, and finally compliance with the suggestion. The incident is curiously similar to the miracle at Cana in Galilee.

In this case, although complying with the suggestion that He should be baptized, His Baptism is for "the fulfilling of all righteousness" by Him (Matt. iii. 15), and not for remission of sins—except as a step towards the "taking away of the sin of the world" (John i. 29).

The account of the Baptism which follows shows that this Gospel, while recording the human affection of Jesus for His family, fully indicates His heavenly origin and divine nature.

* John xxi. 1; Gospel of Peter (end). This, of course, was not written by St. Peter. Its date is said to be about A.D. 130.

† *The Risen Master*, pp. 320, 322.

‡ Hieron, *adv. Pelag.*, iii. 2, Westcott, pp. 463-464.

"According to the Gospel written in Hebrew which the Nazarenes use it is said: The Holy Spirit with full stream shall come down upon Him [the Branch of Jesse]. . . . Moreover, in the Gospel of which I made mention above we find this written: Now it came to pass when the Lord had come up out of the water, the Holy Spirit with full stream came down and rested upon Him and said to Him: My Son, in all the Prophets I was waiting for Thee, that Thou shouldst come, and I might rest in Thee. For Thou art My rest; Thou art My Firstborn Son, who reignest for ever."*

CONCLUSION

In conclusion I wish to say that though I am very doubtful whether the account of this Gospel of the appearance to St. James is true, I certainly say that it *may* be true; and that I earnestly hope that theologians and critics will give it their earnest consideration and enquire into it anew. With the explanations here given it is entirely uncontradicted by the canonical Scriptures.

J. THEODORE DODD.

THE STRUCTURE OF RELIGION IN THE OLD TESTAMENT†

"BEHOLD the days come, saith the Lord of Hosts, that I will send a famine on the land, not a famine of bread nor a thirst of water, but of hearing the words of the Lord."

These words of Amos not long since struck deep into my heart as I listened to them being read in the venerable Church of Canterbury at Evensong. The solemnity of the Church and the voice of the Canon reading no doubt added to their significance, but whatever contributed to their effect, I was vividly reminded of the solemn words spoken many years since by a wise and courageous divine to two persons who were loudly denouncing scientific study of the Bible as blasphemous. He dared to warn them that idolatry was often punished by the shattering of the idol, and that opportunity abused led to the loss of opportunity. "Beware lest your Bible be taken from you," he said, "because you have given it a place that belongs only to God." This warning was certainly severe, but it is largely justified by what has happened. One must not be over-severe with those whom the first shock of critical conclusions filled with horror. It was in many ways a quite natural fear that any tampering with traditional bulwarks of

* Westcott, p. 464; Jerome, Comm. on Isa. xi. 2; Nicholson, 43; Baring-Gould, 142; *Expository Times*, August, 1928, p. 490.

† A paper read at the Middlesbrough Teaching Convention in January, 1929.

faith might lead to the disintegration of the faith altogether. Up to a point, conservatism is the duty of the Church. But there comes a point at which justifiable caution becomes dangerous obscurantism. And long ago that point was reached in Old Testament criticism. One may interpolate here that the course of New Testament criticism seems to give some fresh colour to the wisdom of conservatism. I shall not in this paper deal with New Testament criticism. I would state, however, my conviction that the Faith has nothing ultimately to fear from the most searching criticism of the New Testament. Alarming theories are, of course, put forward with sometimes too much of an air of finality, and one suspects that some critics too readily assume that strictly critical methods prove as destructive to traditional views of Christian origins and history as to traditional views of the Mosaic Code or the history of Israel. Here there is still need of patience. In any case, frank facing of the truth is the only sure way to firm and sound faith. The nemesis of stubborn obscurantism is that the defenders and critics of traditional beliefs alike come to regard them as irrational. There are those who in so many words acknowledge that their faith is irrational. That proves to countless others a formidable obstacle to belief.

More and more, the ever-increasing mass of knowledge on the plane of scientific discovery is making it difficult for people to appreciate the reality of truths of value. They seek to rest on demonstrable certainties, and propose to found a new religious temper on the certain bases of Darwinism, with or without the additional basis of psychology. To people so inclined the claims of Christianity seem to be unreal, even if beautiful. Nothing, they think, must be accepted that is incapable of scientific or mathematical proof. Such an attitude is really inconsistent with much of their general behaviour, as has been repeatedly pointed out. But the very exigency and importance of the claims of religion—the very seriousness of committing oneself in this particular matter—must make us very patient and sympathetic with those whose whole tenour of thought makes it difficult for them to appreciate the nature of the reality of religious truth. Such people are, of course, greatly hindered by the seeming irrationality of the traditional belief of Christianity.

Does intelligent study of the Bible give assistance here? Can it be truly urged that, rightly read, the Bible does give a revelation of God that need neither be rejected as irrational nor suspected as unreal? I believe that it does. I believe that many lines of argument could be urged, and were it possible within the limits of this paper to urge all, they would be found

to converge; thus, for instance, the very topography of the Holy Land, as Sir G. A. Smith has shown in his book, *The Historical Geography of the Holy Land*, is very significant. I am, however, compelled to restrict myself to one line of argument, and for the purpose of that argument I ask you to consider the three stages of the Hebrew Canon of Scripture—that is, the three parts into which the Hebrew original of the Old Testament is divided: the Law, the Prophets, and the Writings. I hope to show that each division broadly represents an essential element in any true religion, and that each is in itself preparatory and incomplete, leading up to Christianity, in which is found the completion and the synthesis of them all.

Here it is necessary to remark that while the three divisions represent chronologically three successive stages in the formation of the Canon, it is not to be supposed that the documents in the second stage are later in date than all the documents in the first, or those of the third necessarily later in date than those in the second. On the contrary, it is generally acknowledged, and may be taken as certain, that within the first division we must recognize at least three stages, known as JE, or early narratives and law; D, the code embodied in Deuteronomy; and P, the priestly code interwoven at a late date with the earlier documents, and that all three owe much to the work of those very men whose writings form the second division, the Prophets. My purpose in reviewing each division separately, though not without chronological significance, is rather, at least primarily, to separate three elements in religion, all of which are essential to a full and true faith.

I. THE LAW

The Law, which meant so much to the Hebrews, and which must have some permanent significance and claim upon believers in Christianity, which sprang out of Judaism, is pre-eminently representative of that element in religion which is known as institutional. It is the standing protest against individualism. From the first the religion which gave birth to Christianity was essentially institutional. The revelation of God comes through and is mediated by the life of the Beloved Community, the Chosen People, the Children of Israel. The early interest is national. The call of Abraham, the adventure of Joseph, the slavery in, and deliverance from, Egypt tell the story of the forming of the Chosen People into a nation. The guiding hand of God is everywhere revealed: naïvely in the continual passing over of the elder son in favour of the younger, crudely in the frank folk-lore of such stories as the circumcision of

Moses, and with strange flashes of deep mysticism as in the story of Isaac's wrestling with the Angel at Peniel. We are enabled by the preservation of every bit of antique tradition to trace from these earliest narratives the slow evolution of the faith of Israel from the crude laws of taboo enshrined in such commands as "Thou shalt not seethe a kid in its mother's milk"—a command at one time clearly regarded as of paramount importance—up to that lofty ethical monotheism which, largely under the guidance of the Prophets, emerges in the Deuteronomic Code. That code is at once ethical, monotheistic, religious, and intensely institutional. One God, one Law, one Temple, one faith, are its themes. How lofty its conception is can be recognized from the fact that St. Paul in the Epistle to the Romans uses the language therein applied by Moses to the Law to describe the greater blessedness of faith. In Deuteronomy we see the essential institutionalism of the Law sublimated by intense religious feeling and ennobled by a lofty ethic. The last stage of the Law is represented by the Priestly Code: this stage represents the endeavour to fix for ever the true worship and faith of Jehovah by means of exceedingly systematic legislation, by means of concrete pictures and ideas—in short, by carrying to an extreme that principle of institutionalism which is already clear in JE and D. The Priestly Code exhibits both the strength and the weakness of this institutionalism. The inspiringness of the Law can be gauged from Psalm cxix.; its danger of hard, high and dry legalism and formalism is sadly revealed in the behaviour of Pharisee and Sadducee in the New Testament. But though the Law is thus seen to be, from one point of view, the monument of the sterility of sheer institutionalism, it remains also an indication of the essential place of institutionalism in religion. Our Lord Himself averred that He came not to destroy, but to fulfil the Law; St. Paul equally guards himself against condemnation of the Law as such. Only in Christ is the institution sublimated to its true function. Informed by the Holy Spirit, the code gives place to an inward spirit of holiness; in Christ the Chosen People become the Church, the Body of which He is the Head. The sterility is removed, and the Church becomes a living, growing, expanding organism. Here, then, I submit, we trace the course of a preparation, rational and real, which finds its only true consummation in that supreme revelation in Christ which endorses its reality and crowns its rationality.

II. THE PROPHETS

The story of the rise of the prophetic element in the history of Israel is, like the story of the Law, one of evolution of the crude to the sublime. The earliest narratives of the Prophets show us men who seem curiously like dervishes, noted for ecstatic behaviour, trances, and consulted as seers. Later we see them at court consulted on matters of national policy, and at times rebuking monarchs; later still they emerge as the unflinching champions of the theocratic ideal of statesmanship, and occupying a difficult and lonely position as the opponents of popular political ambitions, the denouncers of social evils, and the often rejected and despised preachers of a high ethical standard and lofty religious ideals. The Prophets are not philosophers; they are not "students of political economy." Their standing and claim is based on a religious experience of God. They form no definite school or succession. Each is a lonely figure, but they all have this in common: that they are intensely aware of God and are moved to utterance by an overpowering sense of His call to them to speak. It may seem, then, odd to claim, as I do now claim, that the Prophets stand for that aspect of religion which one may call intellectual. If by intellectual religion we mean that attitude to religion which a man arrives at after hard thought, by some such process of reasoning as that the world implies a Creator, and if there be a Creator he must possess a certain character, and to him a man must have a certain relation, the Prophets cannot be said to be examples of such a type of religion. They never argue about the existence of God. They do not reason from nature or history to God, but rather from God to nature, to history, to problems. In that sense, however, they are intellectual. They make deductions from the nature of God as to the personal, social, and religious and political duty of the Hebrew people. They trace the causes of Israel's disasters to their disloyalty to Jehovah, they encourage the people in times of danger by reminding them of Jehovah's power, they boldly promise blessings for the future on condition of repentance and faith. Their appeal is more directly to the conscience than to the reason, but it is often through the reason to the conscience. They speak as thinking men to thinking men, testing every situation by the standard of the theocracy.

There are many today whose consciences are stirred by social needs. They want to see wrongs put right, injustices ended, and miseries relieved. Often this drives them to a rediscovery of religion. For such men the Prophets have a clear message. They boldly claim that Jehovah is righteous,

and that righteousness exalteth the people who name His Name.

In the writings of the Prophets, then, we see religion as something more than a code of ceremonial observances; we see it as claiming that all men's conduct and every situation in life is to be controlled by faith.

And yet, like the Law, that section of the Old Testament which we call the Prophets is incomplete. Isaiah can rise to that magnificent conception of the Suffering Servant. The book of Jonah contains a challenge to the Church as urgent and impressive today as ever. But what is the message of the Prophets but a challenge, a demand for a whole-heartedness in religion which the weakness of man persistently fails to attain? The Prophets look forward to something unrealized in their own age. It is no wonder that prophecy faded into apocalyptic, its challenge into the almost despairing hope of eschatology. Prophecy is incomplete pending the bestowal upon the Church of that Holy Spirit by virtue of whose power the Apostles became the witnesses of Christ throughout the world. Like the Law, it points forward to its fulfilment in Christ.

III. THE WRITINGS

The third element of religion of which I would speak is personal religion. This may be mystical or practical, beset by doubt, or so sublimely confident that it interprets all things in the terms of its own faith. This is precisely what we find in the third section of the Hebrew Bible. The mystical experience of the Psalms remains today the richest treasury of devotion for the Christian soul. The colder practical wisdom of the book of Proverbs has its message for the man to whom the warmer devotion of mystical religion is strange and even unattractive. For how many in our own age is the book of Ecclesiastes almost the reflection of their own questionings! How many find their own obstinate doubts in the face of suffering expressed in the exquisite poetry of the book of Job! And there are surely those, too, who must sympathize with the chronicler's bold rewriting of history in the light of his own personal conviction that God must have acted thus! I do not deny that many sections of the Psalms, expressed so personally, were really national or that Proverbs really expresses an almost national attitude in times of perplexity—the point I desire to make is not, I think, invalidated. The institutionalism of the Law and the ethical teaching of the Prophets is seen in this third section variously and manifoldly applied to personal life—in its aspects of faith and doubt, practical be-

haviour, and the interpretation of events. Creed and Ideal, Practice and Ethics, to be real and vital, must affect conduct. Religion is ultimately and supremely personal. Yet here, too, the incompleteness of the Old Testament is apparent. The vindictive passages in the Psalms are not to be explained away. A religion based on the book of Proverbs only would be a jejune faith. Job does not finally solve his problems nor the preacher his doubts; the noblest passages in the Psalter cry out for a fulfilment more intimate and complete than their writer could realize. For instance, how wistful are the longings for immortality! There is a passion of unfulfilment even in such phrases as "In Thy presence is fulness of joy," or even "Lord, I have loved the habitation of Thy house." "Blessed are they that dwell in Thy courts. They will be always praising Thee." Consider the triumphant close of the twenty-second Psalm. Is it complete? In this section we find the richest example of apocalyptic in the Old Testament in the book of Daniel. Though it may be true that the eschatology of Judaism is an expression of hope rather than of despair, as Dr. Scott Holland urged, yet in it there is a note of despair. Trust in God remains unconquerable, but His victory can only be imagined as a catastrophic cutting across the normal current of events, a decisive judgment of a *Deus ex machina*. Personal religion consists in enduring with this hope in the future. The third section of the Hebrew Canon thus shows less of development than the other sections; though in the Psalter marked development could be traced, uncertain though all reconstruction of dates of particular Psalms still is, but the third section, like the other two, is incomplete. Various types of personal religion are presented to us, and each shows signs of exhaustion or fancifulness, and in the end we see that curious phenomenon of eschatology emerging, which is from some aspects so noble, from others so sterile.

In concluding this rapid survey of the Old Testament Scriptures, I desire to gather up the three main contentions of my argument. Each section represents a picture of one essential strain in true religion, incomplete, pointing forward to a consummation unrealized. Institutionalism looks forward to that conception of the Church as the Body of Christ which St. Paul so emphasizes; the intellectual strain is prophetic of the ethic, the evangelism, and the dynamic which Christianity has in history clearly shown; the strain of personal religion is fulfilled in that mystical doctrine of the indwelling Christ, and the other fundamental doctrine of the Holy Spirit, doctrines which are essential to Christianity and deserving of greater attention than they sometimes receive.

In the second place, I submit that the Scriptures vindicate the rationality of the Christian religion. Rationality belongs properly to processes. Given the existence of God, is the process by which Christianity came to be a rational revelation of that God? We see in the Scriptures how the conception of God which is essential to Christianity emerged from the crude beginnings of Semitic mythology. We see how in its development the monotheism of Israel was embodied in institutions, was applied to moral questions, was the basis of a deep personal religion. These are all massive facts of history. But only in Christianity do they find fulfilment and become satisfactory.

The third point is the most important and the most difficult. Do these processes which we have traced, these aspects of religion which we have surveyed, indicate a reality which can make definite claims upon our allegiance? It is surely impossible to dismiss as wholly illusory that central conception which prompted and guided so massive an evolution. Can the Hebrew awareness of God be regarded as merely a subjective idea? If we acknowledge the reality of beauty and the magnitude of the debt we owe to Greece in regard to æsthetics, can we do less to the religious contribution of the Hebrews? Yet it depends wholly on the acknowledgment of the living God and His willingness to manifest Himself to those who will believe in Him; not only that, but it leads inevitably to the self-revelation of God in Christ. Apart from Christianity the religion of the Old Testament remains a magnificent fragment, incomplete, massive, but lacking finality. It cries out for something more, for a spirit which shall transform its institutions, empower its aspirations, give abidingness and fruitfulness to its devotion. Christ is the end of the Law, the Messiah of the Prophets, and the longed-for Lover of the Psalmists. Therefore we claim that God, who in many measures and by various means had spoken aforetime, hath in these last days spoken by One who is His Son. Out of Zion hath God appeared in perfect beauty.

J. R. DARBYSHIRE.

THE INCARNATION*

I THINK that there are a good many people who, if they were asked, "What is Christianity?" would point without hesitation to the Sermon on the Mount. "That," they would say, "is the sum or essence of the Gospel. Being a Christian means living in accordance with those precepts."

* A paper read at the Middlesbrough Teaching Convention in January, 1929.

But in fact nobody does live in accordance with them, and nobody can. Any real attempt to carry them out literally would bring about the dissolution of any ordered or civilized society. *Give to him that asketh of thee* would encourage hordes of idle vagabonds, and speedily dissipate resources which might have served some useful purpose if they had been employed more wisely. *Resist not him that is evil* would leave the community at the mercy of the thief and the murderer. *Judge not, that ye be not judged*, would prevent the settlement of any dispute of any kind.

I need not labour the point further. It is clear that these precepts cannot be obeyed literally. And if we begin to water down what we profess to regard as a Divine code, where are we to stop? If we admit that selections may be made—this is to be obeyed, that cannot be—we must allow every man to make his own until eventually there will be little, if anything, left. If we regard the Sermon on the Mount as an immutable ethical code we shall find ourselves forced to one of three conclusions:

1. Christianity is futile. Common sense bids us discard it and try to find something else which can really work.

2. Christianity is a dream. A beautiful dream, perhaps, but still no more than a dream. Its ideal is to be compared with the presentation of life offered to us in novels or on the stage, which owes its attractiveness to the fact that it has, and can have, no real relation to the life we live in the world we know.

3. Christianity concerns private life only. With business, politics, or public affairs of any kind it has nothing to do.

Our world has come dangerously near acquiescing in this last conclusion, which I cannot call anything but desperate, and acting upon it. None of these conclusions can be accepted by anybody here tonight.

Now, if logic and experience combined force you inexorably to an impossible conclusion, you must assume that your premise, the point from which you start, is wrong. That is so here. The Sermon on the Mount is not the essence of Christianity. It is in a sense irrelevant. It belongs to the old order, because it is prior to the Crucifixion, Resurrection, and Ascension. It is said that every one of its precepts can be found in the writings of earlier Jewish Rabbis. For anything I know, that may be true. Presumably those writings contain a good deal beside.

The sum of the Gospel is *The Word became flesh*—in theological language the Incarnation. The belief that in the historical prophet of Nazareth the eternal, creative energy of God was manifested as fully as is, or ever can be, possible

under the conditions of human life. The good news which turned the world upside down was not the report of what Jesus had said, but the knowledge of what God has done for the world in and through Him. To revere Christ as a great Teacher, superficially comparable with others, even if you count Him the greatest of all, is irrelevant if you stop there. It is better than ignoring Him completely, but it does not bring you within the Christian circle. It does not make the Christian way of looking at things intelligible, any more than to call the Pope an important, interesting, and picturesque figure makes me a Roman Catholic. If I were to go a little further and were to call him the premier Bishop, which he undoubtedly is, a Roman Catholic would reply with perfect justice, "That is not the point."

As soon as Christianity moved out into the heathen world Christians found themselves confronted with innumerable ethical, social, and religious difficulties. These were much the same as those which we have to meet, only rather more acute. The Epistles of the New Testament were written to deal with them. Most of the Epistles were written before our Gospels, and are the oldest Christian writings we possess. But the Apostolic writers never quote our Lord's words, which presumably they must have known at least as well as we do. They do not approach their problems in that kind of way at all. They are confident that the solution of every problem which can arise is in their hands. But it is not to be found in anything which Christ said. It is in what He was, is, and has done.

Because He died upon the Cross, rose from the dead, ascended into heaven, and sitteth at the right hand of God, the world has become an entirely different place. Man's immemorial struggle with sin has not been ended, but it has been changed from a losing into a winning battle. (That is, I think, the best metaphor to illustrate what a Christian understands by Redemption.) And these tremendous events have given the world, for the first time, a true view of the nature of God, the nature of man, the relation between man and God, and (arising out of this) the relation between a man and his neighbour. All other views on these points which have been held, or ever may be held, fall short of the truth (to say the least) and are therefore misleading.

In the light of this new knowledge (which is the Christian secret, but a secret which the whole world is invited to share) a solution of every problem which can arise is possible. It may not be obvious, but it is there, and it can be found. No situation can ever arise either in private or in public life on which this new knowledge does not bear directly. This is the foundation of Christian ethics. I do not think that they admit of rational

defence on any other basis, especially where the relations between the sexes are concerned. Certainly I am not prepared to defend, or even to discuss, them upon any other.

The Epistle to the Hebrews opens with the words *God . . . hath in these last days spoken unto us by His Son*. But it does not contain a single saying of our Lord from beginning to end. It is entirely taken up with what Christ is, what He has done on earth and is doing in heaven. That is what the author understood by the Gospel message. Those tremendous facts were to him what remained unshaken when the world with which he and his readers had been familiar was crashing about their ears. The outcome of them is the inexhaustible armoury of the Church.

Of course, there can be no absolute proof of them. It is impossible to prove that God became Incarnate in Jesus of Nazareth. Few things do admit of real proof, and whenever an estimate of character enters in proof is always impossible.

If we have to appoint another person to fill a post of any kind we rely on our estimate of his character and capacity. The event may always prove us to have been mistaken. As Christians we are bound to stake everything on a particular estimate of the character, if we may so say, of Jesus Christ, and that estimate may turn out to be wrong. Our religion calls us to take that risk, and therefore it is of the nature of a high adventure. It is something worth offering to valiant and self-respecting souls. If you are not prepared to take risks you had better leave it alone altogether. If your motto is *Safety First* you will have to confine yourself to more pedestrian exercises, such as the multiplication table. No doubt you will have your reward, and may never know how much you have missed. But your opinions about Christian belief and ethics will be of no value. If the risk appears terrifying, this may be said. Those who have staked most upon the character of Christ—I mean the saints of all ages and countries—have always been increasingly confident as they went on that they had not believed a lie. That is encouraging for us who are not great enough to hazard an equal stake, and so to win an equal assurance at first-hand.

But how can the same person be described rightly as both God and man? That is a perfectly fair question; more, it is a very interesting and important one. But like many of the most interesting and important questions we cannot answer it. If I am asked, "How *could* the Son of God become man?" I can only reply, "I do not know." I think we should need to know all that there is to be known about God, and all that there is to be known about ourselves, before we could be in a position to give any other answer. Meanwhile, we can only maintain resolutely our conviction that any description, any estimate,

of Him which falls short of that contained in the Nicene Creed is inadequate. We should, in fact, be prepared to say more, if stronger expressions could be found. For nearly 1,500 years the Church has agreed to use the phrase *Two natures in one Person*. But that does not really explain anything. It only states the difficulty afresh. The chief value of the phrase is that it excludes certain speculations, which would, in fact, pare away the truth which they profess to expound. Perhaps at some future time some better phrase will be devised.

The Incarnation is, and must always remain, a mystery. If there were no mystery in our religion, if its very heart were not mysterious, we should know at once that it is not what it professes to be—namely, a real revelation of the Most High. As one man cannot set a puzzle which another cannot solve, so if there were nothing mysterious in our religion we should know at once, know with absolute certainty, that it was the product of human brains like our own. And it would be of no more use than an empty cup to a thirsty man.

For nothing save mystery can waken wonder, and wonder is the seed of all spiritual and intellectual growth. Without wonder there can be no adoration, and religion without adoration is a contradiction in terms. Adoration alone can lift virtue to a religious level, and satisfy the deepest need of the human soul.

This is summed up in a saying which has been ascribed to our Lord Himself. Perhaps it is not quite unworthy to have fallen from His lips.

“Let him that seeketh cease not until he find, and when he findeth he shall wonder. Wondering he shall reach the kingdom, and when he reacheth the kingdom he shall have rest.”

R. H. MALDEN.

AN INDEPENDENT REVIEW OF AUTHORITY

I. THE NATURE OF AUTHORITY

ALL authority, whether intellectual or practical, has much in common. The very word implies moral considerations. Authority, unless it is usurped or unconscionable or expressly qualified in some such manner as involves unrighteousness, or at least the absence of its usual moral claim, means something which ought to be obeyed. The person who flies in the face of

authority is not merely foolish, but if he does so wilfully is in some degree culpable and blameworthy.

This is a commonplace in the practical affairs of life. Put in theological language, it means that the powers that be are ordained of God for the good ordering of mankind. Of course, there may exist authorities whom it is a duty to resist; but that duty of resistance arises in spite of their being authorities, because they are bad ones, and their claim is consequently overridden by the duty owed to some higher authority. But if the world is running on lines which are in any approximate degree the lines on which it ought (again this word expressing moral obligation) to be running, then we find, as we should expect, that the several authorities in their respective spheres enjoy a moral claim to reverence and obedience.

But exactly the same is true of intellectual authority. It is something which rightly commands respect, and does not simply invite it. A person who obstinately refuses to be convinced may be invincibly stupid, and in that case he is allowed to be excused for his perverseness; but unless he can justly claim the privilege of invincible stupidity he is blameworthy. He deserves as strong a moral condemnation as the man who disobeys the police.

All authority, then, makes claims in some degree upon conscience. It has to be accepted by the individual by a moral judgment and an act of faith. That is why in practical affairs government can only be carried on in the long run with the consent of the governed. Similarly in the affairs of the mind, in the long run authority will fail which does not succeed in producing conviction in the minds of individual people—such a conviction as carries with it the obligation to respect.

At this point one hears the whisper "private judgment." This phrase, like so many other catchwords, is often used in a misleading and irrational sense. No authority, whether good or bad, arbitrary or rational, can be accepted without an act of faith in the competence of that authority. This act of faith on the part of the individual is precisely what is meant by the acceptance of authority. There can be no authority without it, except one that relies solely on brute force, and such a one is not likely to be permanent. But it does not in the least follow, because authority is accepted on conviction by a private and individual act, that the authority so accepted is simply and solely that of one's own private and individual mental processes, or even the mental processes of a number of other persons. Indeed, this is normally very far from being the truth.

I have not the privilege of acquaintance with Dr. Einstein, nor do I profess any competence to judge of his theories, nevertheless I am perfectly ready, indeed anxious, to accept his con-

clusions so far as I am capable of comprehending them. I conceive this to be not my whim, but my duty. Yet my attitude is not determined by any direct confidence in him, for I do not know him; nor by any confidence in my own reasoning powers, for I am entirely ignorant of higher mathematics. It is inconceivable that Dr. Einstein himself believes his own theories merely because he thought of them and worked them out. Both he and I and everybody else believe in them because we all have sufficient ground for confidence that they would approve themselves to any competent mind before which they might be adequately put. The authority to which we all adhere is that of the general human reason; our act of faith is mainly an act of faith in the powers of understanding universally bestowed upon the human race by God, and used by Him as the focus of His revelation in the scientific sphere.

In a secondary sense we may be said to trust our experts and the judgments which they may pronounce upon questions in which they are competent to express an opinion. And that involves a judgment on our part that the persons in question really are experts, and really are competent judges in the matter at issue; it must be remembered that for right conclusions about spiritual matters we must look to spiritual men. But this faith in experts is purely secondary. They are not thought trustworthy because their minds work differently from other minds; on the contrary, if that were the case they would rightly be considered to be cranks. They are only trusted because justification has been found for thinking that they are truly representative of normal human reasoning. All minds would work alike in like circumstances; if the same data were put before anybody who was unprejudiced, and capable by reason of intelligence, training, and specific experience in the given field of enquiry of understanding the data, he would arrive at similar conclusions. So our real faith is in human (and divine) reason, that Logos which means much the same in the early Christian Fathers whether it is written with a capital initial or a small one; and faith is rendered to the expert only in so far as he is a competent agent and expression of that ultimate authority. This is true both of the layman's and of the expert's own faith: the real authority lies right outside personal considerations and individual limitations.

II. REVELATION

One section of an article affords very small space to discuss such a large question as revelation. But some sort of summary discussion of it must be attempted, since it is impossible to

consider what authority lies behind the claim that such and such doctrines are matter of revelation until it has been ascertained what revelation means.

On the Christian hypothesis God is not a liar. He is Truth and Light; in plain terms, in His nature is to be found certainty both intellectual and moral. The reasonable inference from this is that He does not deceive mankind, but that what He reveals is true. We have already had a hint of this in connection with human speculation, when we stated that He employs reason as the channel or focus of revelation in speculative matters; if Einstein is right, he is right not because he is Einstein, but because God revealed the truth to him, in the sphere of that human reason which is in the image of the divine reason.

But God might conceivably make revelations through all manner of channels, and on the Christian hypothesis whatever God says is true. Any Christian will accept it without further question if it can be shown that God said it. On the side of God's revelation there is no room for any doubt or misconception. But difficulty does arise, and very serious difficulty, on the side of man's hearing and perception. Before it is possible to accept anything as divine revelation it is absolutely necessary to be assured that man hears God aright, and that is a very different matter. So we must analyze the contents of revelation, and try to discover just what manner of authority they possess.

Without stopping to argue over the exact details, about which, however, a good deal might be said, and ought to be said, in any adequate general apologetic, we may lay down the proposition that in some manner the course of history is subject to the guidance of a divine overruling which we call providence. Whatever happens can only happen subject to the divine permission; and, again, whatever events take place are employed by God as starting-points for an ever-fresh influence upon the course of events yet to come. In some such sense, then, it is contended by Christians that historical events contain for those with eyes to see a disclosure of divine action and divine purposes.

This belief forms the foundation of Old Testament revelation. God chose the Jewish people for certain purposes of spiritual revelation, and those with eyes to see detected His messages by reflection on the course of Hebrew history. Now, in dealing with higher mathematics we should expect to find the competent agents of revelation among higher mathematicians. So in spiritual matters we look for the competent agents of revelation among spiritual men, those who by converse and experience may be expected to be in close touch with the mind of God upon such subjects. And we find such agents in the prophets.

But there were all sorts of prophets, true and false. And even the true prophets made mistakes. And the criterion of prophecy is similar to that of science. The righteousness of God is not to be accepted because Amos declared it, though perhaps he was the first to declare it. It is to be accepted because the doctrine, once proclaimed, is self-evident to everybody who believes in God and tries to serve Him in any place and at any time. This is a matter of the very first importance, because it leads directly to the conclusion that of the whole content of Old Testament revelation the only things which are directly revealed are events and facts, not doctrines. The doctrines are inferences from the facts, inspired inferences, perhaps, but still inferences. God did not, strictly speaking, say to mankind, "I am righteous"; Amos said it, and we can only demand its acceptance as true because we are convinced that spiritual men, the competent agents of the general human reason, which is our real authority for the belief, are bound the world over to endorse Amos' judgment in the matter.

Now let us proceed to the Christian revelation. The first obvious matter of direct divine revelation here is the actual life of Christ. In it is directly revealed the life of God under human conditions. But this is matter of fact, not matter of doctrine. Even our Lord's own teaching does not stand on such a clear foundation of direct revelation as does His life, because the Evangelists, quite apart from the question of accurate translation from the spoken Aramaic to the written Greek, quite obviously show no special concern to report Christ *verbatim*; their accounts of the same discourses differ in form, even when they concur in substance, and they tell us themselves that certain parts of His teaching were not understood as and when first delivered. On these grounds alone, apart from any others which theologians might conceivably raise, it is plain that our Lord's teaching as reported is not so certainly direct and immediate matter of revelation as are the historical facts of His earthly existence.

So much must suffice for illustration. Had I space to continue I should say about the teaching of the Apostles and the later Church that in the main it has authority of the same kind, though different in degree (since the circumstances are so different after the coming of Messias), that I have attributed to the teaching of the prophets. For one thing, the Church has facts to work on of immeasurably greater richness and detail. For another, it derives from the Apostles who were personally trained by Christ. For another, it enjoys a special dispensation of the Holy Spirit, and a far deeper and more widely diffused experience of spiritual unity with the mind of God. But in its

original *depositum fidei* matter of fact bulks more largely than matter of doctrine or organization. Most of Christian doctrine (for instance, the cardinal doctrines of the Trinity and Incarnation) and most of the Church's administrative system (for instance, episcopacy) is, strictly, matter of inspired inference from fact rather than matter of direct revelation. I believe with all my heart that these things are right and true, and binding upon conscience; I am not discussing their truth, but the way their truth has been revealed.

III. FUNDAMENTALISM

Quite naturally, as all will agree, and quite properly, as most Christians will admit, when the Apostles and their immediate following had once arrived at the final and complete conviction that Christ was God Incarnate (a conviction probably not made final and absolute until after the Resurrection, it should be remembered) they were disposed to accept literally and without question everything that was credibly reported of His teaching. On various grounds of converging significance they regarded Him as the perfect embodiment of that general human reason which is consciously or unconsciously our ultimate authority, and such of His utterances as had been preserved were treated as possessing oracular force. They might be capable of verification, but certainly did not require it. No sane person thought of questioning them. Very early His life and teaching were written down in three Gospels, to which a fourth was soon added, and this fourfold strand or four-square foundation was accepted as containing the authentic record of these unquestionable things.

To the Gospels were added the collected writings of St. Paul and of other Apostles; what was believed to be genuinely Apostolic was retained, and the rest discarded. The reason for this is clear: the Apostles may have learned from our Lord much that was not contained in the Gospels, and in any case possessed a unique knowledge of Him and of His mind.

At the same time, the whole of the Old Testament was taken over bodily from the Jews. But although its inspiration was insisted on, it held a very different position from the New Testament, owing to the obscure and sometimes contradictory testimony which it could be made to bear. It is a very simple matter to trace in the second century, in the third, the fourth, and for many years after, the supreme uncertainty which was felt about its actual meaning and practical bearing upon Christian truth. And since by means of the method of allegorical interpretation, which was devised to overcome this difficulty, the Old Testament could be made to mean practically anything that

was desired, reference to its pages as to an oracular authority was not of great use in determining doctrinal disputes. Nevertheless, oracular appeal came to be regularly made both to it (in so far as it could be made to bear any direct testimony) and to the New Testament, which enshrined the records of Christ and His Apostles.

This is the root of all Fundamentalism, ancient, mediæval, and modern. It invokes an oracle from which an answer is expected that will be guaranteed correct, instead of employing the powers of spiritual discernment which God has bestowed upon mankind and upon which Christ promised the blessing of guidance by the Holy Spirit. Fundamentalism employs a mechanical and not a spiritual method. It is not, of course, wrong necessarily because it is mechanical. But since its operation does unquestionably resemble that of a machine, and not a mind, it puts faith on a lower spiritual plane. Everything which comes out of the machine is accurately finished precisely to the right proportions, and we know beforehand that it will be so. There is no need to look and see, or exercise our judgment on the product. There is, indeed, an act of faith involved in its use; but it is an act of faith in the accuracy of the machine, not in the character of the product. So Fundamentalism has indeed faith, but its faith is in the mechanism of revelation, not in the revelation itself.

Having thus stated the principle of Fundamentalism I must be as brief as possible in tracing its history. It began, as has been said, with faith in an infallible oracular Bible—that is, a Bible which was guaranteed mechanically to give correct answers on all points which it covered without further need of verification.

But the Bible does not by any means cover the whole ground of religion in detail, and on many points it became obvious almost from the first that the Bible itself needed interpretation by the living Church, which had indeed produced the Bible. So here was another organ of authority, which in practice interpreted and supplemented the Bible. From the beginning of the fourth century this authority functioned through Councils. At first Councils were regarded as anything but infallible; Council succeeded Council with bewildering frequency and bewildering variety of conclusions, and one seemed about as representative as another. But time passed, and four Councils were taken as approved, and were alone recognized as “œcumenical,” not, it may be noted, because they were one fraction more representative than others, but simply because the mind of the Church accepted their conclusions as true in themselves. Those Councils were believed to have been right. Later still, other Councils were added to the number as other matters rose for decision.

Because these Councils were right, their conclusions became as a practical matter irreversible. But in course of time it was forgotten that the "Œcumenical Councils" were only a small selection out of a much larger number, most of which resembled them in every particular except in having important conclusions accepted irreversibly by the mind of the Church; and the idea arose that if proper precautions were taken to summon a truly representative Council, it would be incapable of making mistakes, and would render mechanically correct answers to the questions put to it. St. Athanasius or anyone else who had lived in the fourth century would scarcely have cherished a notion so utterly contrary to their own experience. Nevertheless, Fundamentalism was thus extended to General Councils.

Finally, the same principle was extended still further, and the result is Papal Infallibility. The original Roman claims were in the main judicial: the Papal see claimed appeal jurisdiction over the whole Church, and so far as this was admitted attempted to act as a final court to decide between contending teachers which was orthodox and which heretical. But as its claims to jurisdiction widened and its actual power increased over the Western portion of the divided Church, the question inevitably emerged whether Pope or Council were supreme, and the equally inevitable answer was reached by which all, and more than all, that had ever been claimed for General Councils was attributed to the Pope. He is now the High Priest of the Fundamentalist principle.

I have myself been offered by a Roman clergyman, as an inducement to Anglicans to submit to the Roman see, the promise of having any doubtful point of doctrine infallibly decided by merely taking the trouble to apply to Rome. He was not perhaps a very highly responsible agent, and I feel pretty sure that he would have been disowned if I had accepted his offer. But he truly represented the logical outcome and ideal of the Fundamentalist principle. When you possess an infallible instrument of ready-reckoning, you cannot but look forward to the time when it will have finished its work. Item after item must be added to the store of guaranteed information, until at last every conceivable question has been given its infallible solution. It is strongly symptomatic of this feeling that a certain school of Roman Catholic thought is now insisting that a man may believe every single article of the Catholic faith, but even then he will not be a Catholic unless he believes them on the Pope's authority. Members of this school do not believe the faith is true, as the Fathers did; they only believe that Papal definitions are correct. Their act of faith is merely in the accuracy of the instrument.

LEONARD PRESTIGE.

(To be continued.)

MISCELLANEA

NOTES AND COMMENTS

THE Editor will be away from England from Easter until April 26. Any necessary correspondence relating to THEOLOGY during that period should be addressed to Dr. Lowther Clarke, S.P.C.K., 7, Northumberland Avenue, W.C. 2. It is requested that articles submitted for publication should not be sent to the Editor before May 1.

The Editor frequently receives books for review in THEOLOGY direct from authors or publishers; and he desires to repeat the request that all books for review should be sent to the S.P.C.K., where arrangements for noticing them are promptly made. The result otherwise is probably delay.

Dr. Lowther Clarke's note, published below, on K. Weindinger's *Die Haustafeln*, raises questions of the deepest interest and shows how necessary it is that more attention should be given in this country to the Moral Theology of the New Testament. Dr. Clarke's allusion to Bremond's *Histoire Littéraire du Sentiment Religieux en France* and the work of Bérulle is aptly illustrated, as it happens, by the approach to the problem of the Incarnation in Mr. Malden's article printed above. Readers of the present Bishop of Oxford's Bampton Lectures on Christian Ethics will observe that those lectures are in the Bérulle tradition.

We have received a copy of a pamphlet, entitled *A Christian State*, by Sir Lewis Dibdin (Macmillan and Co., 6d. net). It consists of the two articles which he contributed to *The Times* on January 7 and 8 of this year, together with a Preface in which he replies to Lord Hugh Cecil's criticisms. The pamphlet contains a valuable collection of relevant facts bearing on the nature of the Establishment of the Church of England. But we wish that Sir Lewis Dibdin had been prepared to consider at greater length the contention that the existing law of Church and State needs revision.

NOTES

"DIE HAUSTAFELN"

Die Haustafeln (by K. Weindinger: Leipzig, Hinrichs, 1928) is a title so hard to translate into English that we had better retain it as a technical term. Though it goes back to the section-headings of Luther's Bible, it is not given in Flügel-Schmidt-Tanger's Dictionary. In the ancient world, by the side of the public State morality appearing, for example, in the Twelve Tables of ancient Rome, there was a code of private, domestic morality which the Germans call "House-Tables," dealing with the duties of husbands and wives, parents and children, masters and slaves, or, by an extension, with those of different classes in a community towards one another. The thesis is that certain sections of the New

Testament reproduce the stock exhortations (*paraenesis*) setting forth this code. In an extreme form it was stated in 1903 by Seeberg, who found in the Epistles many stock phrases of catechetical instruction. Our present subject concerns a few clearly defined passages only, which were first put in this light by Dibelius, whose thesis is now worked out by Herr Weindinger in a competent monograph. The special importance of the theory in N.T. exegesis is this: if it holds good, then we cannot draw any conclusions as to the conditions of the various Churches addressed in the Epistles from the passages in questions. At the same time the discussion throws a welcome light on the problems of first-century Christianity.

The earliest attempt to grapple with the moral problems of the young Church appears in 1 Corinthians and is conditioned by St. Paul's eschatology. Especially in ch. vii., dealing with marriage problems, we see that questions are answered in one way rather than another because the apostle believes in the imminent end of the age. Now suppose a missionary at a somewhat later period, when the eschatological hope was beginning to recede, without St. Paul's genius, confronted with ethical problems—what can he do but adopt and adapt the best morality of the period? This, it is claimed, is what St. Paul himself did a few years later, and *a fortiori* other teachers. Their main source was Hellenistic Judaism, that is to say Judaism uprooted from the soil of Palestine, finding most of the ceremonial law impossible and emphasizing a high morality. Such Jewish ethical teaching is hard to reconstruct, for Sirach, etc., are a literary redaction of it, and the popular synagogue instruction is lost. Probably Tobit iv. and xii. are the best early examples of stock moral exhortation, there embedded in the framework of a narrative. But parts of the Ahikar-saga, pseudo-Phocylides, the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs and Philo also provide useful material. To them, as our sources, we must add the Hellenistic material of pagan moralists; also, for the first Christians, such Words of the Lord Jesus as were applicable. The records of pagan ethics are, like the Jewish, largely literary, and some allowance must be made for this factor. There is no reason to suspect any important change in pagan ideals during the first three centuries, so we may draw upon later writers to illustrate the N.T. books. The point then is that there was a body of unwritten morality, part of which found literary expression, generally accepted in the Mediterranean world which the early Church took over. The two clearest references to it are Sophocles' *Antigone* 454 f. where Antigone insists on obeying the *ἀγραπτα καὶ σφαλῇ θεῶν νόμιμα* rather than Creon's orders, and Xenophon's *Memorabilia* IV., 4, 19-24, where Socrates and Hippias discuss *νόμιμα ἀγραφα*. The fundamental precepts were to fear the Gods, honour parents, bury the dead, love one's friends, be faithful to one's country. It is to them that St. Paul refers in Romans ii. 14—"Gentiles which have no law do by nature the things of the law." Here he recognizes the substantial identity of Jewish and Greek morality and thereby sanctions the taking over of the *Haustafeln*.

Let us now look at some of the N.T. passages.

(a) Col. iii. 18 ff. There is nothing specifically Christian in these verses, any more than in Phil. iv. 8; a Stoic could have written them, except for the formula "in the Lord," which Christianizes them in the simplest possible way. Verse 21 is found almost verbatim in passages of Menander. But with v. 22, advice to slaves, we reach newly stamped Christian teaching.

(b) Titus ii. 1-10. Here we notice in v. 2 the Christian triad—faith, love, and endurance (a variant for hope)—and the two *iva*-clauses of 5 b and 10 b; all else is common stock.

(c) Ephesians v. 22 ff., according to the hypothesis, need not be derived from Colossians. The passage is a combination of *Haustafeln* with Christian teaching, imperfectly fused. Thus "Himself the saviour of the body" has no parallel in the application to husband and wife.

(d) 1 Peter ii. 13-iii. 7 forms a complicated problem too long to discuss. Note these points: (i.) the introduction follows a common practice in pagan *Tafeln* of introducing duty towards the State (*τὸ πρὸς πατρίδα καθήκον*). (ii.) Dependence on Rom. xiii is improbable, for would 1 Peter have omitted the Christian colouring: "There is no power but of God," etc.? (iii.) The exhortation to slaves is given two motives, "What glory is it if, when ye sin, and are buffeted . . .," which might have been said by a Cynic, and the magnificent Good Friday appeal.

(e) Many passages in 1 Timothy. *E.g.*, ii. 9 has "shame" (*αἰδώς*) as a female virtue, specifically Greek, and here only in N.T. In iii. the virtues of a bishop are essentially the conventional ones of biographies and inscriptions and even correspond largely with those expected in a general in Onosander *de imperatoris officio*. This being so, "the husband of one wife" must, as in similar catalogues, be directed against polygamy. The widows, however, of ch. v. are clearly a Christian institution and the precepts are framed freshly for them.

Weindinger pursues the enquiry into the Apostolic Fathers, where we must not follow him. It will have been noticed that the method has little bearing on problems of authorship. If St. Paul utilized *Haustafeln* in Colossians he may have done so to a considerable extent in the Pastorals. Still more may St. Peter, whom no one claims as an original thinker, have done so in 1 Peter.

Rather than criticize the theory (which, subject to discussion of details, is surely sound) and its implications for Christianity in my own words, I add a summary of a page in H. Bremond's *Histoire Littéraire du Sentiment Religieux en France* (III. 134). He has been discussing the great Bérulle (died 1629, founder of the Oratory and leader of "the French School" of spirituality). He finds Bérulle's importance in this, that he was an innovator, basing Christian asceticism on the theology of St. Paul and St. John. From Cassian to Rodriguez the stream of Christian moralists had followed another method, less supernatural, less theological. They had resembled the pagan moralists such as the Stoics. Their works would be helpful in training an unbeliever. Bérulle, on the contrary, is *theocentric*. To put on Christ, rather than imitate Him, is his watchword. Christian morality is obtained by devotion to the Incarnate Word, who lives within the soul. Bremond's thesis is quite extraordinarily important. What is now a commonplace of Christian devotional practice arose, he maintains, as the fruit of the Counter-Reformation. But is he right in tracing the other method only so far back as Cassian? Are not the Pastorals a clear example of the morality which a Stoic could have appreciated? If we say Yes, we can proceed to ask whether any other method was possible for the Church than to take over the highest existing morality and gradually raise it through the indwelling of the Incarnate Word in generations of Christian lives.

Two final questions. Is the *extent* of the use of *Haustafeln* in the Pastoral Epistles a decisive argument against Pauline authorship? Is

moral progress possible along the lines of "putting on Christ" unless at the same time we firmly adhere to this imitation and practise all that is of permanent value in the Stoic discipline?

W. K. L. C.

NOTES ON PERIODICALS

Zeitschrift für die A. T. liche Wissenschaft. 1928. Heft 4.

The chief article is by J. BEGRICH and deals at great length with expressions of confidence in God as found in Hebrew Psalms where the individual laments his lot and in the corresponding Babylonian documents. The latter, which are far older than the former, provide the literary type for the former, but the Hebrew genius has re-created the Babylonian formulas. For conventional, flattering addresses to the gods it has substituted living, personal appeals. It is noticeable that the Babylonian "Father" is avoided by the Hebrews in addressing Jehovah. Was this due to prophetic teaching? So long as Canaanite influence was to be feared, the conception of Father, with its correlative Mother, was dangerous.

The other article, by W. J. GRUFFYDD of Cardiff, studies "Moses in the Light of Comparative Folklore," i.e., the fourth "branch" of the Mabinogion, without convincing the reader that so late a document has any "light" to throw on the subject.

W. K. L. C.

Zeitschrift für die N.T. liche Wissenschaft. 1928. Heft 3/4.

The chief article is a very careful study by E. LOHMEYER of the First Epistle of St. John in which a seven-fold structure is made out as follows: (1) Prologue, i. 1-4; (2) the first word of revelation, "God is Light . . ." and the homiletic sequence to it, i. 5-ii. 6; (3) the second word, the "new commandment," ii. 7-17, and its sequence; (4) Christians and followers of Antichrist, ii. 18-iii. 24; (5) concerning Love, iv. 1-21; (6) concerning Faith, v. 1-12; (7) Epilogue, v. 13-21. The whole is built up round (4), which alone is linked with contemporary facts of history. The writers ("we") speak in prophetic strain throughout and argument, such as we find in St. Paul, is absent. Within each of the seven divisions are seven sub-divisions, which Lohmeyer defines in accordance with the principles of ancient artistic prose style, Greek as well as Hebrew, which recent investigation has recognized. He allows that some of his divisions may be arbitrary, but it cannot be an accident that both "little children" and "I write" occur seven times, and the study as a whole must be on the right lines. Two important results follow. The document is no letter but a carefully planned product of Christian prophecy, and all partition theories are refuted. Now Lohmeyer has already established the seven-fold scheme for the Fourth Gospel, see THEOLOGY, November, 1928, and for the Apocalypse, where such demonstration was indeed hardly needed. The scheme is confined to the Johannine writings, apart from certain groupings in St. Matthew. The Gospel, Epistle and Apocalypse accordingly form a clearly defined group of writings dealing with past, present and future according to a definite plan.

TH. HERMANN contributes an essay on the Patriarch Paul of Antioch

and the Alexandrian Schism of 575. G. MEGAS writes most ingeniously on "Adam's *χειρόγραφον*: a contribution to the study of Col. ii. 13-15." He begins with a modern Greek folk-tale, in which the Devil makes a pact with Adam, writing it with blood drawn from Adam's palm. Adam was buried on the spot where Jesus was crucified, His blood dripping down till it reached the hand and washed away the blood which the Devil used for the bond, thus taking away the primal sin. Adam, it should be said, was cast out of Paradise into darkness, and the Devil in return for the bond gave him light (alternating with darkness). The tale is then traced back to the Slavonic Book of Adam and to Cretan legends, and brought into relation with the mass of stories, including the Faust-saga, which deal with the same motive. Greek hymns and prayers and mediæval art also illustrate it. It is a long way back to Colossians, *ἐξαλείψας τὸ καθ' ἡμῶν χειρόγραφον τοῖς δόγμασιν ὃ ἦν ὑπεναντίον ἡμῖν*, "having blotted out the bond written in (better, consisting in) ordinances that was against us," but the parallel is too striking to be missed. St. Paul is speaking of Baptism and his thought is parallel to that of Rom. v. 12-vi. 10 and 1 Cor. xv. 21, 22, 45-49. A parallel is drawn between the first and second Adams. "In Adam all die." Therefore "being dead through trespasses" in Col. ii. 13 will refer to the sin of the first Adam, which was caused by the Tempter (cf. Heb. ii. 14, 15, where "he that has the power of death" is the Devil). Now *χειρόγραφον* is the regular Hellenistic word for a post-obit; Adam's bond takes effect on his descendants. *δόγμα* in the *Koine* is a word of wide meaning, and the *δόγματα* in our passage are the clauses of the bond, what the man has to discharge. The Devil holds the bond, but it was given him by the father of the human race. Similar explanations are given by Origen and Chrysostom. Closely connected with all this is the baptismal rite of exorcising the Devil and the Conception of Baptism as "sealing" for Christ. The "nailing to the Cross" of the bond is best explained as an allusion to the custom of overcoming demons by nailing them symbolically to trees, walls, etc. Perhaps we may add to this summary of a brilliant essay the reminder that, if St. Paul had such thoughts in mind, he need not be imagined to have accepted all the implications of the phraseology he used.

A posthumous article by LIDZBARSKI on the Mandæans, one by MARMORSTEIN on the Apocryphal book of Jeremiah, and one by VON DOBSCHÜTZ on Matthew as Rabbi and Catechist, maintaining that "Matthew" was a Jewish Rabbi turned Christian, who was influenced by the Third Gospel, conclude a number of exceptional brilliance.

W. K. L. C.

Harvard Theological Review. October, 1928.

This most important number is entirely devoted to a critical monograph of 200 pages on the Cæsarean Text of Mark by K. Lake, R. P. Blake and Silva New. The problem is of comparatively recent origin. The special text of Codex 1 and its allies, also of 13 and its allies, had been recognized, though not much attention had been paid to it. Now however it is reinforced not only by the cursives 28, 565, and 700, but by the uncials (Θ) (Koridethi, at Tiflis, first made known by von Soden) and W (Washington, discovered in 1906), and by P 13416 (the Berlin papyrus fragment published in 1927). To these the Old Georgian Version is to be

added, also quotations from Origen and Eusebius. The importance of the newly isolated family was emphasized by Streeter in *The Four Gospels*, where he maintained that Origen in his Commentary on John used the Alexandrian text (B \aleph) of Mark in the first ten books and in the later books and elsewhere, after he went to Cæsarea, used "fam. Θ ," or the Cæsarean text. The Harvard writers correct this verdict and find that such evidence as there is suggests that Origen in quoting Mark used the text of family (Θ) at Alexandria too. Inconclusive as the evidence is for Mark as used at Alexandria, it is clear that Origen when he came to write his Commentary on Matthew used a copy of Mark that had the Θ -text throughout; and equally clear that he used the Neutral text (or (Alexandrian) when he first arrived at Cæsarea.

After a very full discussion and collations of Mark i., vi. and xi. the following conclusions emerge: (1) The Greek MSS. studied all represent the same text, more or less corrected by the later ecclesiastical text; (2) there existed in the fourth century a Syriac version of the Cæsarean text, which was the parent of the Old Armenian Version, from which in its turn the Old Georgian was made. However, the Cæsarean text was never a single entity like the Vulgate or Peshitto but rather resembled the European Old Latin, a series of interlocking texts.

What light does the investigation throw on the burning question of the origin of the Neutral text? It was in existence in Egypt in the fourth century and apparently used by Athanasius. But when we go back to Origen, so far as Mark is concerned, there is more to connect it with Cæsarea than with Alexandria. The Neutral and Cæsarean texts are closely connected, both were used by Origen, neither can be proved before his time. The utmost that can be said for the Neutral text is that it is one of the texts current in the third century. The evidence of the second century supports the "Western" text. None the less the Neutral text may be earlier though the evidence for it is later. But if the Neutral text is to be saved "it can only be by reversing the method of Hort . . . and by insisting on subjective rather than objective criticism. This we believe is right. Ultimately all intelligent criticism is subjective."

How Dean Burgon would have rejoiced to see this day! He maintained that the minuscules represented an old text forgotten when \aleph and B were made and recovered later. While no one now would express himself quite in this way yet it is significant that fam. 1 and fam. 13 are among the chief witnesses for the Cæsarean text.

What difference does it make? the reader may ask. In the first eleven verses of Mark i., to give an example, the following changes would have to be made in the Revised Version if the Cæsarean text were followed: 1, omit "the Son of God"; 7, omit "stoop down"; 8, read "I baptize" for "I baptized"; 10, after "the Spirit" add "of God"; 11, for "came" read "was heard."

Harvard Theological Review. January, 1929.

This contains two articles on Georgian Versions, and a very useful one on the Ahmadiya Movement in Islam, i.e., that represented in England by the Woking Mosque.

W. K. L. C.

Revue d'Histoire Ecclésiastique.

The January number opens with a learned article by Father Leben on the quotations from the Greek Fathers in the "Seal of Faith," an Armenian patristic collection discovered in November, 1911, by Bishop Karapet Ter-Mekerttschian, in the convent of St. Stephen, at Daraschamb. The discoverer edited the text, and published it in substantial form in 1914, but he published it in Armenian, with the result that the bishop's learned labours have been largely ignored, even by the specialists to whom he specially appeals. It is with peculiar pleasure that we welcome this contribution to the study of Greek patristics. Father Leben carefully arranges the quotations in alphabetical order, and as he simply indicates these quotations, it is plain that his article is packed with matter. Among the fathers most frequently cited we note Cyril of Alexandria, the three Gregories, Proclus of Constantinople, and there are also three creeds. Father Langlois investigates some of the relations of Madame de Maintenon with the Holy See. Most of us associate her with the lamentable repeal of the Edict of Nantes, a project that apparently falls outside the scope of this article. For what is in the mind of its author is the determination of the policies pursued by Rome and Paris respectively. Innocent XI. set out with the clear determination of the preservation of the doctrinal independence seriously threatened by the Gallican decrees of 1681, decrees which indicated that Louis XIV. gravely aspired to play the rôle of Henry VIII. Just as the matrimonial schemes of the English monarch hindered the papal plans, so the matrimonial schemes of the French one helped the papal plans, and one of the many merits of Father Langlois's account is the careful presentation of the fashion in which the ambition of Madame de Maintenon to marry Louis XIV. subserved the projects of Innocent XI., the pope who made the Revolution of 1688 possible. Father Halkin provides the oldest text of the decree promulgated against the Lutherans in September and October, 1520.

R. H. MURRAY.

Jewish Quarterly Review. Vol. xix., No. 3.

Dr. Louis Finkelstein writes on the Grace after Meals, *Birkath ha-Mazon*. He points out an interesting parallel between the Grace and the Thanksgiving after Communion in the Didache. The parallel is worthy of study by liturgical students (see *The Authorized Daily Prayer Book of the United Hebrew Congregations*, ed. S. Singer, 1924, p. 286; Oesterley, *Jewish Background of the Christian Liturgy*, p. 132; *Jewish Encycl.*, article Didache). Dr. Finkelstein thinks the Grace originally consisted, like the Didache with its threefold thanksgiving, of three benedictions. He believes that the prayer for Jerusalem, to which the third benediction is attached, was composed during the Maccabean struggle when the Temple was in the control of unbelievers; also that the first two benedictions are probably pre-Maccabean. He suggests that the fourth benediction was added when in the early years of Hadrian the Jews were led to believe the Temple would be rebuilt.

Professor Isaac Husik discusses the recent revival of interest in Spinoza, the great Jewish philosopher. In 1920 the *Societas Spinozana* was founded which publishes the *Chronicon Spinozanum*, an annual which receives contributions from scholars of many lands. Dr. M. Mayer of Heidelberg, with knowledge gained by new material, writes in one of these volumes

on Spinoza's refusal of the chair of philosophy in the University of Heidelberg. Leon Roth of the Hebrew University of Jerusalem points out in another that the Jewish intellectual atmosphere of Amsterdam was favourable to the development of such views as Spinoza came to hold. Carl Gebhardt of Frankfort on the Main calls attention to a certain Juan de Prado who associated with Spinoza, and helped to shake the faith of the latter in orthodox Judaism.

Professor Husik also contributes a note on Leon Roth's *Spinoza, Descartes and Maimonides* (Oxford, 1924), in which he claims, like other Jewish scholars before him, a continuity of thought between Maimonides (1135-1204, the greatest Jewish philosopher of the Middle Ages) and Spinoza.

R. D. MIDDLETON.

The Journal of Religion. Vol. ix., No. 1. (University of Chicago Press.)

The Canadian Journal of Religious Thought. Vol. v., No. 6. (Toronto.)

The real question concerning Reunion, which is, of course, not so much a matter of the amalgamation of different sects as of a really Catholic Christianity, emerges from a comparison of two articles contained in the above-named journals. In the *Journal of Religion* the question is raised in an interesting form by one who handles the subject of mutual tolerance between Catholics and Protestants with sympathy and insight, from the point of view of a Catholic who clearly understands the term only to apply to those of the Roman obedience, and looks forward to the acceptance by America of a Catholicism which would be "of greater importance to Rome than even the adoption of Christianity by the Emperor Constantine." The naïveté of so ingenuous a plea should not, however, deter anyone from reading and considering the article in question, which, it may be necessary to add, is designated, "Can there be Tolerance without Understanding?" If he turns, then, to the subject of "Catholic Protestantism" in the *Canadian Journal of Religious Thought*, the reader will find set before him "a chain of irrefutable evidence, not only that the leading Reformers asserted the principle of the catholicity and ecumenicity of the Visible Church, but also that their followers adhered to the same principle and believed in their own catholicity to the exclusion of the Roman claims." Indeed, Luther, we are told, "in repudiating Rome meant to indicate not his own, but Rome's exclusion from the Catholic Church." Will all the tolerance in the world resolve so acute a problem? Yet it is the fundamental issue. Is it possible to equate Catholicity with Rome and at the same time to exclude her altogether? These two articles, then, need to be set side by side. And he who reads the Canadian journal will also enjoy the Chancellor's sermon before Victoria University, Toronto. It deals with the Christian view of Suffering, and is an admirably balanced exposition of "Redemption through suffering" as a law of life. But the opening article in the American journal will surely produce a feeling of uneasiness. The Jerusalem Conference is accused of enunciating a Christo-centric gospel of minimized supernaturalism, religiously weak and ineffectual, as well as scientifically untenable; neither good science nor good religion; instead of "the Christ who is a power for good in the world today, the Christ who exists as an idea and an ideal in the hearts of his people, an ideal which is incarnated in human lives in the form of victorious habits and self-sacrificing service." But, is "good religion" "the dis-

covery and the unfolding of what virtues and values inhere in the cosmic order"? Or, is it that "Christ *becomes* (italics ours) the church's highest symbol of human perfection, and the Kingdom of Heaven her best concept of a perfect social order"? Is it that "Jesus Christ is superior then to other religious figures, not because he alone can lay claim to a peculiar divine nature, but rather because the *concept of Christ*,* as it has evolved to date within the Christian movement, is more alluring and more challenging than the ideal religious figures which have been the products of other religious movements"? Is it either good science or good religion to put the cart before the horse?

H. S. MARSHALL.

The Church Overseas. January, 1929.

The Bishop of Salisbury analyzes the work of the Jerusalem Conference and shows how it focussed the various problems of the present world situation—viz., racial relationships, industrial issues, demands for education, and the self-consciousness of indigenous churches; the chief menace was revealed everywhere as secularism. Canon Raven calls attention to the urgent and divine challenge latent in the need of reunion and its possibilities. Dr. Lukyn Williams describes past and present efforts made towards the evangelization of the Jews. The problem needs more study, and a more adequate presentation of the Gospel is required; the Person of our Lord should receive the chief emphasis. The Rev. G. Hibbert Ware deals with the Indians domiciled in South Africa; their political and economic situation is fairly safe though needing improvement; a separate church is not necessary and not desired by them, and their inclusion requires the conversion of the church as much as their own. The Rev. H. E. Hyde outlines the Church's efforts towards the welfare of the new settlers in Western Australia, especially since the War. Canon Garfield Williams and Miss Ruth Rouse plead for more prayer.

The International Review of Missions. January, 1929.

The editors provide a valuable survey of the past year's situation and work, including that of the Roman Communion, which latter also recurs in a paper by the Rev. C. Goodrich on the past ten years' work of American Roman Catholics in China, and in Father de Ghellinck's wonderful tale of the fine service and devotion of John of Monte Corvino, a thirteenth-century pioneer in China. Canon Raven contributes a further study of our Lord's teaching method in the light of today's practice; His method was to consider the whole personality of His pupil and to train it in community life; to create first an atmosphere, then to link all activities with the sense of God's Being, to attach men to Himself as the revelation of God, and finally to make them work out the details and the application of the ideas assimilated. Dr. Nicol MacNicol says that the enemy of Christianity in India is no longer Hinduism or Islam but secularism; religious interest is giving place to political activity and to materialism; Christianity must safeguard the spirituality of her message, nor make too ready terms with Indian thought, and avoid all suspicion of partisanship. Professor J. Richter discusses the question of native education in Africa, and Mr. C. Frimodt-Møller urges that unless native churches undertake

* *Author's Italics.*

the ministry of healing during the next half-century the opportunity will pass into the hands of the State. The Rev. W. H. Murray Walton illustrates the work and growing usefulness of evangelism through the Press in Japan, and the Rev. W. R. Wheeler the fine work now being done by the French Government in the Cameroons to counteract sleeping sickness.

S. P. T. PRIDEAUX.

Theologische Blätter. January.

Professor Albrecht writes on the latest revision of Luther's Bible (1913), in answer to criticisms of E. Hirsch. Professor E. Seeberg discusses the fundamental points in the "Concordat" question in Prussia, and concludes that what is needed is a concordat with the Catholic Church and a State contract with the Evangelical Church.

Theologische Blätter. February.

Professor Strothmann reviews the position of the Orthodox Church in Turkey and in Egypt—that is to say, of the two patriarchates of Constantinople and Alexandria. As to the former, it is noted that a new autocephalous church has arisen in Albania, and that Italy has claimed in 1927 that the Metropolitan of Rhodes should receive the title of Exarch. With regard to the latter, attention is drawn to the fact that the patriarch Meletius consecrated Nikola Abdulla as Metropolitan of the Orthodox Syrians.

Professor E. von Dobschütz adds a few notes on the subject of redemption, which was discussed at the second German Evangelical Theological Conference, held at Frankfort on the Main, October 9 to 12, 1928.

Theologische Blätter. March.

H. Preisker's lecture, given at Jerusalem in the German Evangelical Institute on September 20, 1928, is reported, in which the lecturer compares the political development and religious tendencies of Jerusalem and Damascus, with special reference to St. Paul's visit to the latter city before and after his conversion.

G. Krüger reviews M. Heidegger's book on *Existence and Time*.

The discussion on the concordat question in Prussia, opened by E. Seeberg, is continued by H. Mulert, and is accentuated by a vigorous letter of protest addressed by E. Seeberg to the Evangelical Union concerning their criticism of his attitude.

L. PATTERSON.

REVIEW

THE CONSTITUTIONAL HISTORY OF THE AUSTRALIAN CHURCH.
By R. A. Giles. Skeffington. 16s.

Five years ago the late Archbishop of Melbourne, Dr. H. Lowther Clarke, produced an invaluable collection of records under the title *Constitutional Church Government*, covering in the main the world-wide extensions of the Church from English sources. It was the sort of volume that only the venerable Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge could be expected to publish, and renewed thanks are due for its appearance. Mr. R. A. Giles, who came from the diocese of Ballarat ten years ago, after serving as Chaplain with the Anzacs, a welcome recruit for the depleted clergy of this country, continues the work with an intensive study of Australian conditions. In elegant Latin, which does credit to his original college in the Victorian city, he dedicates his book to the Archbishop, his predecessor in the field, and the Bishop of Salisbury adds a foreword recognizing the loyalty and discretion with which he builds on the foundation already laid. The discretion is admirably named, for Mr. Giles has naturally found by extended research some gaps to be filled and two or three mistakes to be corrected in the Archbishop's summary. To make matters even, we will begin by noting one of his own mistakes—the only one, in fact, which our imperfect information has detected. On page 111, within a dozen lines we find two statements. The first: "The Act of 1866 is substantially that which binds the Church in New South Wales." The second concerns the 1902 Act: "This Act repealed the 1866 Act . . . and is substantially that which binds the Church of England in New South Wales at the present time (1928)." A correction, perhaps in proof, seems to have been imperfectly made.

This duty performed, we can give ourselves to a whole-hearted appreciation of the book. In the compass of a hundred and thirteen pages Mr. Giles provides an Appendix of twenty-four documents, ranging from the royal appointment of the first Chaplain in the year 1786 to the draft of a "Constitution of the Church of England in Australia," adopted by a General Convention in October, 1926, "for consideration by the Diocesan Synods." The first Chaplain, Richard Johnson, was directed by the King to supply the ministrations of the Church to all and sundry "within our territory called New South Wales," which then extended coastwise from the extreme south of the

continent to Torres Strait in the north, with indefinite extension westward. The draft Constitution is concerned with twenty-five Archbishops and Bishops exercising spiritual jurisdiction over the whole continent, Tasmania, and parts of New Guinea. This compares poorly with a similar expansion covering exactly the same period in North America, but it is eminently respectable; and, to be sure, they did not begin *ab uno* in America.

Mr. Giles does not confine himself to bare facts. He comments on them freely, and sometimes caustically. Like his predecessor, he directs attention to the assumptions of royal authority in the earlier stages of his story. Mr. Johnson was to obey all orders and directions given him by the Governor "or any other your superior officer, according to the rules and discipline of war." He was, in effect, an Army Chaplain, the whole settlement being under military government. In 1824 the Bishop of Calcutta was ordered by Royal Letters Patent to take episcopal charge of New South Wales "during our pleasure," and empowered to appoint Commissaries to represent him there. At the same time an Archdeacon was appointed, also by Patent, who was to report himself on arrival to the Governor, and then to exercise archidiaconal functions. Simultaneously, a despatch was addressed to the Governor, ordering him to give all facilities for these functions, with a remarkable addition; should the Archdeacon report to him that a clergyman ought, "in the interests of religion," to be suspended from duty, "you will be authorized to act upon the Archdeacon's recommendation and responsibility, and to suspend any such clergyman accordingly." In 1836 followed the Letters Patent appointing the first "Bishop of Australia"; these contained the clauses against which Selwyn protested some years later on his appointment to New Zealand, granting "full power and authority" to confirm and to ordain. These were patient of a benign interpretation as implying a removal of possible obstacles raised on legal grounds, but they were equally patient of a more sinister explanation. In a word, the Church made its first appearance in the country as a royal foundation, with all the misconceptions and limitations inseparable from such conditions of existence. These were the more dangerous, since all was done at a time when the phrase "established by law" was commonly understood in the worst possible sense.

Mr. Giles is keenly aware of these drawbacks, and a great part of his book is devoted to a study of repercussions from them which are not yet exhausted. He is, indeed, so much concerned with the bad effect that he seems to have overlooked one good feature of the procedure by Letters Patent. It is that in all the documents emanating from the Crown there

was assumed to be a necessary Church Order which needed no new enactment, but had only to be adjusted to the difficult conditions of a newly settled country. Thus the first document of the Appendix is concerned with providing for "the due and canonical superintendence of ecclesiastic persons" in the territory affected. The first Archdeacon appointed is to execute his jurisdiction and function "in as full and ample manner as the same are or may be lawfully exercised by any Archdeacon within our realm of England," *exceptis excipiendis*. Document F speaks of "the exercise of the ordinary Episcopal jurisdiction" without further definition. The first Bishop of Australia is appointed to supply the lack of "a Bishop residing or exercising Jurisdiction and Canonical Functions within the same," and in addition to duties unnecessarily specified in the Patent he is to "perform all other Functions peculiar and appropriate to the Office of Bishop."

Failure to recognize these necessary conditions of Church Order, and especially those peculiar and appropriate to the Office of Bishop, has been the cause of most of the troubles which Mr. Giles narrates. When the outcome of the Colenso litigation determined the legal ineffectiveness of the Letters Patent in the later circumstances of the Colonies, those who had been accustomed to think of episcopal powers as derived from them were helplessly at a loss. Some of the Australian Bishops, notably Tyrrell of Newcastle and Short of Adelaide, were aware of their own standing in the traditions of the Catholic Church, but others were less certain, and the flocks of all were distracted by contradictory ideas. The first Bishop of Melbourne felt so helpless that he procured an Act of the Victorian legislature to settle his position, even while his colleagues elsewhere kept on working patiently at the problem. The Church in that Colony thus became, in the strict sense, though not in the popular sense of the words, "established by law." Elsewhere two courses of action were debated: the method of "consensual organization" suggested to the South African Church by a judgment of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, and the method of an "Enabling Act" to be sought from the local legislature. Tyrrell at first thought that either method would produce "a mere rope of sand," but afterwards saw possibilities in both. In South Australia, under a Bishop who believed in episcopacy, there was an early attempt at a consensual compact, and violent protests were made against "any assumption of ecclesiastical authority by the Church of this Province," and the holding of "a Synod or Convocation, which the Constitutional law does not allow." One ardent agitator saw the Bishops intriguing "not only for ecclesiastical authority,

but for secular power." So hard was it for men steeped in the tradition of an established Church to distinguish the two things. At Sydney still greater alarm was rife; an Enabling Act was proposed, and a Protestant minister, apparently having no connection with the Church of England, suggested that what was being sought was power to "enforce discipline either by fine, imprisonment, or capital punishment." At one time a petition was addressed to the Crown declaring "that the body of English ecclesiastical law has not yet been adapted to the wants and necessities of the Church in the Colonies: that the jurisdiction of the Bishop over the clergy is left without any prescribed form of process; that there is no prescribed form or mode of appeal to the metropolitan, or of giving effect to the sentence of his court; that the periodical meeting of the Bishop, clergy, and laity in diocesan assemblies is as yet unauthorized by the supreme authority of the Crown." The conception of a body of customary or canonical law derived from the earliest ages, incorporated into the English "ecclesiastical law," and of permanent authority, seems to have dawned on few Australian minds. This petition drew a reply from "several high legal authorities" to the effect that it was possible for a Colonial diocese to organize itself without Imperial legislation. It is interesting to observe that one of these legal luminaries was Sir Richard Bethell, afterwards Lord Westbury, whose name is usually associated with opinions of another kind. It was he who, fifteen years afterwards, gave the judgment in the Colenso case which at once scandalized English Churchmen and paved the way for the emancipation of the South African Church.

Through this welter of confusion the Australian Bishops, of divided counsels themselves and ruling flocks still more at odds, patiently plodded their way towards a solution of their difficulties, and went on forming new dioceses without any clear knowledge of what they were doing. It was a great work of faith, carried on by the method of trial and error. Mr. Giles makes two chief difficulties very plain. One was a perverse nomenclature not peculiar to them. Until 1871 they persisted in calling themselves "the United Church of England and Ireland in Australia." Then, in meek subservience to an Act of Parliament, they dropped the mention of Ireland and dubbed themselves "the Church of England in Australia." There is one poor precedent for this style. It is like speaking of "the Church of Rome" in a sense far removed from that of the historic *Ecclesia Romana*. But, however excusable, it has had the effect of perpetuating the notion that they are bound to adhere to the most local and particular features of the Church

as "established" in England. One wiseacre objected to the holding of Synods without licence from the Crown under the Act for the Submission of Clergy, although such a licence would almost certainly have been declared null and void by the local judicature. It would have been well, indeed, to take over more whole-heartedly the working system of the Church of England, with gradual modifications as required; but many things desirable were carelessly dropped, and other things are unreasonably retained, because the people love to have it so. One much disputed matter is to the point. The ritual judgments of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council have been jealously retained as binding. After a long struggle this detail of conservatism has been eliminated from the draft Constitution of 1926. It is there provided that no decision of any English court shall bind the ecclesiastical courts of Australia "on any question as to the faith, ritual, ceremonial, or discipline of this Church." Perhaps as a sop to prejudice it is added that such a decision may be cited "as a persuasive precedent." But, indeed, that is in accordance with all sound jurisprudence. One remembers that when the Scottish Free Church case was before the House of Lords Mr. Haldane unhesitatingly cited in that capacity a judgment of the Supreme Court of Illinois, which unhappily was not persuasive enough to move Lord Halsbury.

The other great difficulty to which Mr. Giles makes frequent reference is the dominating idea of what he calls "the Congregational basis." When the "legal nexus" with the Church of England—not yet wholly snapped—was first weakened, congregations and their pastors did not see why they should take orders from Bishops no longer effectively backed by law. The consensual compact was worked in a certain dependence on this sentiment, so that some dioceses were little more than a federation of congregations. When provinces came to be formed, the dioceses were linked in a similar way. In New South Wales they even refused to be bound, without their several consents, by canons or other rulings of the Provincial Synod. It may be said that in the growth of the Catholic Church dioceses were prior to provinces, and were then grouped under metropolitans; but the system, once established, became normal, and should normally govern all extensions of the Church. That rule was observed in the Letters Patent for India, but not in those for Australia, and an obstinate congregationalism has hindered its observance since the Letters Patent ceased. The subsequent union of provinces under a Primate has followed the same irregular course. "The General Synod," says Mr. Giles, "came down on the side of Congregationalism." He adds a misleading comparison with the political configuration

of the country and its "Federal Government." But political Australia is not a Federation of the original independent Colonies it is a unitary "Commonwealth," some rights and powers being saved for the component parts. A similar union may be achieved, with patience, by the Australian Church.

T. A. LACEY.

NOTICES

THE HOLY SPIRIT IN ST. PAUL. By R. Birch Hoyle. Hodder and Stoughton. 8s. 6d.*

A good book like this was badly needed. The whole subject is in a state of confusion. Some scholars lay stress on the Hellenistic idea of spirit as a quasi-material substance; others maintain that for St. Paul the Spirit was identical with the Risen Christ; others again, philosophically inclined, equate the Spirit with the *élan vital*. The whole matter is complicated by the fact that in the ancient world the concept of personality had not emerged; indeed, it has been defined largely as a result of the discussions about the nature of Christ. Mr. Hoyle's method is clearly right. He begins with the creative experience of the Apostle, who was apparently the first to think out the relation between the charismata, or gifts of the Spirit, and the personal Spirit from whom they came. Romans vii. and viii. and Galatians v. and vi. may be taken as representing his own experience. Spirit for him is a distinctively Christian concept. It must be interpreted in the light of the theory of knowledge held in the ancient world; *gnosis* is not a function of the knower, but something other, something without, that presses for an entrance into the human heart.

Then Mr. Hoyle, having fixed St. Paul's experience of the Spirit, shows its distinctive character by comparing it with Jewish and Hellenistic ideas. "It is God Himself interpreted by analogy from the force, thought and reality of the spirit of man within himself and going out to reveal himself. And so in the last analysis 'spirit' is personal as the spirit of man is personal. But Paul is too busy watching the effects of the Spirit's action to analyse the 'superhuman' cause." His theory "brings confusion now because it does not fit in with modern theories of perception and apperception. In his view an external agent came into the human mind and *brought his things with him*. That is precisely how the ancient world thought knowledge was attained." This is a sane, careful, scholarly, and inspiring book, deserving to be widely read.

W. K. LOWTHER CLARKE.

INTELLIGENCE AND MENTAL GROWTH. By Claude A. Claremont, B.Sc. Kegan Paul. 2s. 6d.

This little book belongs to Messrs. Kegan Paul's "Psyche Miniatures" general series. In less than 140 small pages the highly qualified author

* Apologies are due to author and publisher for the belated appearance of this review. The book was sent to a reviewer who was prevented from fulfilling his undertaking, and, after a year, returned it.

discusses the nature and functions of intelligence, which he defines as the possibility of establishing direct perceptions of causation. This thesis, largely original, is developed with great skill, and a light touch which divests the subject of all terrors and many difficulties for the inexperienced reader. Incidentally Mr. Claremont helps to restore the self-respect of unskilful chess-players—"intelligence" being one of the least important elements in proficiency at that game!

E. GRAHAM.

CÆRIMONIALE IN MISSA PRIVATA ET SOLEMNI ALIISQUE FUNCTIONIBUS
LITURGICIS SERVANDUM. C. Callewaert, J.C.D. Beyaert, Bruges.
Fr. 21.

Sancta sancte is the motto of this book, which is simply a very careful and detailed account of the principal ceremonies of the Latin rite, with occasional explanations of their meaning. *Mutatis mutandis*, a study of such books would be of value to Anglican priests, and might enable them to minister at the altar without the rather distressing peculiarities which are too often noticeable even in those who are very obviously wishing to observe the Catholic tradition. Dr. Callewaert's remarks, for instance, on the custody of the eyes are worthy of consideration, as also is his warning against walking sideways, or even backwards, at the altar. It is interesting to notice his advice that the celebrant should not only understand what he is reading, but show by his voice that he understands it: his approval of the *Messe Dialoguée* in which the congregation makes the responses and joins in the *Gloria*, *Credo*, *Sanctus*, and *Agnus Dei*: his directions to the celebrant as to the ceremonial reception of the offerings of the faithful: the stress laid on the recitation of the words of Consecration *continue*. In view of present difficulties in the Church of England, we may notice also that "Private Exposition" consists merely of opening the Tabernacle, and that the Pyx is not to be taken out except for the purpose of benediction.

K. D. MACKENZIE.

THE DEVELOPMENT OF SACRAMENTALISM. By J. W. C. Wand. Methuen.
6s.

The controversy over the origin of the Christian sacraments has not been without good results. Among these we may certainly count the realization of their place in the history of the religion of mankind as a whole. If the sacraments are not mere survivals from primitive religion, nor corruptions of the Christian Gospel, neither are they, on the other hand, without parentage or relatives. In them the old was made new, sacramentalism took a "fresh start," and the crude fragmentary and tentative ideas and practices of earlier sacramental religion were refounded in a spiritual, full, and final form. In this the sacraments are parallel to the Incarnation itself. Just as it "sums up" the old creation and renews it, so the Christian sacraments may be said to "sum up" the history of human worship and renew it.

From some such point of view Mr. Wand, in this small book, sets out "to trace the history of the fundamental presuppositions" on which the doctrine of the sacraments is built. He chooses the term "sacramentalism" to denote the content of his subject, and means by it "the

habit of thought and practice that sees physical things and uses them as vehicles of spiritual power." This sacramentalism he traces in its various manifestations in primitive religion, the Old Testament, the Mystery Religions, the teaching of our Lord and of the Church down to the present day.

Mr. Wand deals very clearly and reasonably with the material from primitive religion and the Old Testament, particularly with the question of the attitude of the prophets to sacrifice. He finds in the Old Testament three sacramental modes—by word, by action, and by object. All three modes pass on into Christianity. At the Last Supper the emphasis was on the last mode, "on the substances of bread and wine, or rather upon His Body and Blood." Mr. Nock, however, in his recent essay, regards the Eucharist in the New Testament as primarily a sacred *action*, within which a devotion centred in the sacramental objects themselves comes (rightly and legitimately) to be a feature. This is perhaps a more accurate view, and it is not difficult to see how, in a sacramental rite which re-enacts a sacrifice of a *personal, self-offered* Victim, the sacramental objects are bound to take a place which was impossible when the victim was subpersonal.

The part of the book most likely to cause some discussion is that in which the author suggests that Hellenistic sacramental ideas had already to some extent become familiar in Palestinian Judaism, or at any rate in those circles of it from which our Lord and His disciples came, with the consequence that such Hellenistic ideas as may be traced in Christian sacramentalism can have the sanction of our Lord Himself. The hypothesis is worth exploring, but the difficulties are great. The sacramental ideas of the Mystery Religions, especially at this period, are, on examination, ambiguous. Definite evidence in the Gospels for any contact of our Lord's mind with Hellenistic ideas is lacking, and this fact the interesting points adduced by Mr. Wand can hardly outweigh. The Eucharistic action at the Last Supper seems to refer to the Old Testament conception of the covenant-sacrifice, and to be explicable in terms of it. In our Lord's profound and original reading of the Old Testament, much that had lost significance for His contemporaries became living to Him, and this seems to have happened with the covenant-sacrifice conception. Hence the question whether sacramentalism, native or foreign, was alive in contemporary Judaism is deprived of much of its importance.

The treatment of the history of patristic and medieval sacramentalism is clear and valuable. In his interesting comments on some modern theories of the Eucharist, the author (like Canon Quick) perhaps appreciates too little the recent theory of Mr. Will Spens.

This continuous history of the sacramental idea should be most valuable at the present time to priests who wish to give instruction on the subject to educated congregations, and students will find in it a convenient and sound synoptic view as the basis of more detailed study.

H. J. CARPENTER.

THE AUTHORITY OF THE BIBLE. By C. H. Dodd, M.A. Nisbet, London.
10s. 6d.

In this new volume of the "Library of Constructive Theology," Mr. Dodd has given us an interesting and stimulating book. He provides a clear and lively discussion of many of the problems that surround the

use of the Bible today. In several directions he breaks new ground, and this volume must not be classed with the multitude of small books about the Bible that have lately appeared. Though many of his critical assertions are open to dispute in detail, the general point of view is that of most educated men outside the Roman Church. The supreme authority is that which belongs to truth itself. The Bible possesses authority so far as it embodies the apprehension of that truth by specially gifted persons and its working out in the practical life of historical communities, Jewish and Christian. There are several admirable passages. We would call attention, for instance, to the discussions of the analogy between religion and science on pp. 18 ff., of the nature of prophetic inspiration on pp. 63 ff., and of the difficulties surrounding the attempt to assign to the sayings of Christ, as reported in the Gospels, an infallible authority. We could wish that all teachers of religion and all students of theology would read and consider their argument.

But for all its merits, the book, taken as a whole, leaves us unsatisfied. Partly it does not always get right down to the root of the matter. Partly it spends a disproportionate amount of space on the Old Testament as opposed to the New. After all, it is the authority of the latter that is really of most importance. The chief weakness of the book, however, seems to us to spring from the minimizing attitude of the author to worship and cultus. The authority of the Bible is derived in large measure not only from the teaching of prophets or from the social morality of historical communities, but also from the worship of those communities. Mr. Dodd recognizes, indeed, that religion is not mere morality, but he fails to see that the Christian is moral because he is spiritual, not spiritual because he is moral. Throughout he betrays the deep-seated prejudices of the Puritan. His dislike of Catholicism prevents him from doing justice to a figure like Ezekiel. He seems to regard all forms of cultus as at best a dangerous necessity. He misunderstands the place of sacrifice in later Judaism, and assigns to Christ an attitude to Temple worship that contradicts all the evidence that we have. To Christ the Law was the Word of God, and the Temple His Father's house. But the Puritan cannot conceive that the contemplation of the smoke ascending from the altar of sacrifice might awaken and express inward devotion as truly as hearing a sermon. Nor does he really face that historical fact that prophecy in the long run failed, with the mass of the nation. But at least the author does not disguise his likes and dislikes. We hope that the book will have a large circulation.

E. J. BICKNELL.

RELIGION WITHOUT GOD. By Fulton J. Sheen, Ph.D., S.T.D. Longmans, Green and Co. 1928. 15s.

Do Anglicans give sufficient weight to St. Thomas Aquinas? In this book, which seems to be a sort of sequel to the same author's *God and Intelligence*, reviewed in THEOLOGY (August, 1926), those who would wish to make his closer acquaintance under the guidance of an enthusiastic disciple will find an admirable introduction. Dr. Sheen is not only enthusiastic, he is very downright in his methods, and therefore readers will be well advised to proceed with caution. But it is to be hoped that there will be many of them. The vehicle by which the Thomist Philosophy is imparted is contemporary religious statement, which Dr. Sheen likens

to an attempt to conserve religion with God left out through His ceasing to be God in any understandable sense of the word. The first part of the book contains a very wide-ranging survey in which quotations, culled from both books and magazine articles, are given from a perfect army of writers. In the second part the source of their ideas is traced to Luther, Descartes, and Kant; the Philosophy of Individualism, of Fact, and of Value. If the downrightness seems at times out of place in a philosophical treatise, the criticism is acute; the running commentary illuminating; and this section is one which students who are making a first acquaintance with the Philosophy of Religion would assuredly find very helpful. In the third part the whole matter is subjected to the test of the Thomist Philosophy, which triumphs gloriously. Sometimes the learned author appears in the guise of a Fundamentalist, or suspiciously like it; sometimes his confidence is almost too great, at others we feel that we certainly cannot agree, at all events without some qualification, as when we are told that "while it is not to be denied that a Reformation was needed, it was a reformation of discipline that was needed and not a reformation of faith" (p. 114). However, that is only to be expected; nor should it deter anyone from becoming personally acquainted with the many good things that the book contains. One or two examples may serve to whet the appetite: "If the carpenter's rule changed with each beam, even the pragmatist would not want to live in a modern house" (p. 88). "There is a fashion in sciences as there is in clothes" (p. 247). "The *how* things happen is quite a distinct problem from the *why* they happen" (p. 276). It is indeed because this is overlooked that we get the "lyricism of science," to quote Dr. Sheen's own phrase, which springs from "a too general readiness to accept anything which criticizes the traditional, and too great an unwillingness to judge the value of the criticism." If it is true that "some believe that to speak in terms of millions of years gives them a right to dispense with a Creator," which indeed looks rather like an overstatement, then the delightful consequence certainly follows, namely, "this is much like saying that if the crank of an automobile is long enough it will be a self-starter." Perhaps the general position can be summed up in the following two quotations: "It is rather a strange fact that Thomistic and Mediæval philosophy, which is said to be so unscientific, should be the very one to uphold the very reality of science; while our modern philosophy which is said to be born of science and nourished by it, denies it a right to existence, in denying that its ideas are ideas of the real and objective world." "It is incomprehensible to a thinking mind to see how philosophy and civilization are enriched by ceasing to think of God as God and beginning to think of Him as a blind and whirling space-time configuration dancing dizzily in an Einsteinian universe, plunging forward along a path of which He is ignorant, toward a goal of which He knows nothing whatever. At the present time God is *really* denied; but *nominally* asserted. The next step will be to eliminate even the name. That will be the extinction of daylight; then we shall be marching to the music of ghosts and not the voice of reason." Here is a book worth reading. The acutely penetrating insight and power of generalization which Dr. Sheen possesses, coupled with wide reading and a distinct sanity of judgment, make his work important. It is both an excellent antidote and a stimulating tonic.

H. S. MARSHALL

HOMES OF THE PSALMS. By Stacy Waddy. S.P.C.K. 6s.

The author "was in Palestine for nearly seven years in peace and war," and was "always on the look-out for scenes and phrases that illustrated the Bible." With patient industry, and always in a devout spirit, he collects all elements from the topography and life of the Holy Land which may in any way serve to illustrate the Psalms. With much modesty he disclaims any right to form opinions on Hebrew scholarship or literal translation of the text—basing himself, with perhaps too implicit confidence, on Dr. John P. Peters, the illustrious American scholar. In the first part of the book (pp. 66 ff.) and the Appendix, he illustrates the Psalms from the scenery of Palestine—the climate and the seasons, spring and summer—the value of water—the sirocco—the autumn and spring rains—and quotes as examples the very fine description of a storm (Ps. xviii. 7-15) and the magnificent imagery of Ps. xxix. This part of the work will be a source of pleasure and profit to any reader learned or unlearned. The author rightly emphasizes the fact that many of the Psalms were liturgical, and intended to be sung in procession. He takes as an example Ps. lxxxiv. (pp. v, 23-39), which he arranges as a processional, and he (or rather Peters, p. xvii) has come to the conclusion that the very difficult vv. 5^b-7 are "rubrical directions where the procession of worshippers was to march through historic and sacred scenes," translating the rubric thus: "The causeway in the midst—In the valley of weeping—The fountain men made—The leader encircles the pool—From rampart to rampart they go—The God of gods is seen in Zion." We have no space to discuss this theory here; we can only say that we do not find it convincing. Perhaps the most interesting, certainly the most debatable part of this volume is Part III., where Peters' theory that large portions of the Psalter had their origin at the great sacrificial centres of Dan, Bethel, and Mount Gerizim (Shechem) is developed. It is suggested that the collection of the Sons of Korah (xlii.-xlix., lxxxiv.-lxxxix.) belongs to Dan, the collection of Asaph (l., lxxiii.-lxxxiii) to Bethel, and the David collection (li.-lxxii.) to Gerizim. When we consider what the early prophets tell us as to the kind of practices which prevailed at these places (Hos. iv. 15, vi. 9, x. 5-8; Amos. iv. 4, v. 5, viii. 14), it is not easy to think that these beautiful spiritual songs could originate there. And when these groups come to be examined, we shall find in them Psalms of Zion and some which are post-exilic. Thus among the Korah Psalms, xlviii., lxxxiv., and lxxxvii. are pervaded by a sentiment of love for Zion—not only the Temple but the City. In the Asaph Psalms we find Ps. l., which is reflective and probably post-exilic; and Ps. lxxiv. and lxxix., which relate to the ruin of Jerusalem by the Chaldees; and lxxvi., Zion's triumph song. And in the David group we have Ps. lxxv., certainly a song of Zion; and Ps. lxxviii., which we claim to have proved (in our edition of it) to be of Judea and to be post-exilic. The true position seems to be that this method is too mechanical and schematic. There may well be Northern Psalms, but each must be separately examined and based. It cannot be considered a sound method to attach a whole collection to a sacred site without any examination of the date of each individual Psalm, and to treat every mention of Zion, Salem, or Jerusalem as an interpolation of later days (pp. 162-4). Palestine is a very small country, and a Judean poet might well know the scenery of the North as well as many a Londoner knows the Lake District.

We have indicated some points in which we are not able to agree with the author, but there is much in the book as to which we are quite in sympathy with him. The style is attractive, and we feel that to this Christian scholar the work has been a labour of love. We recommend the book to all who love the Psalms and desire to gain a better understanding of them.

W. W. CANNON.

DAS ORTHODOXE CHRISTENTUM DES OSTENS. By Stefan Zankov, Professor in the University of Sofia. Furche-Verlag, Berlin. 6 Marks.

L'EGLISE RUSSÉ. By N. Brian-Chaninov. Bernard Grasset, Paris. 12 francs.

Dr. Zankov's most interesting and valuable lectures, delivered before the University of Berlin, fill a gap in our literature of Orthodox Christianity, and we should heartily welcome a translation of them into English. After an introduction on the outward state of the Orthodox Communion (he reckons no less than twenty autocephalous and autonomous Orthodox Churches), he discusses in turn its doctrine, ecclesiastical outlook, liturgy, and devotional and practical activity. He supports his statements with a great mass of references to Orthodox and non-Orthodox authorities, which is the more necessary, as he takes great pains to dispel the various misunderstandings about Orthodoxy which have arisen in various Western quarters.

His outlook is remarkably similar, not merely in particular details, but also in general spirit, to that of traditional Anglican theology. Thus he constantly appeals to the primitive, and even to the "undivided," Church, like any Tractarian (p. 38). On certain points, such as Original Sin, he is startlingly liberal; but he does not hesitate to quote Khomiakov on Church and Bible ("without a Church, no Canon; without a Canon, no Bible," pp. 41, 72), or gently to rally those who attempted at Lausanne to put forward Episcopacy as the basis of union for Christendom without mentioning the Apostolic Succession. On the crucial point, "Who are members of the Church?" he distinguishes between two schools (p. 74), one of which rigidly limits the Church to the Orthodox Communion, while the other, supported by distinguished names, does not consider the historical non-Orthodox Churches entirely separated from the Church of Christ. Some of his most important matter is to be found in footnotes—e.g., on pages 62, 72, 76, 89, which the reader must on no account neglect. His account of the position of the Œcumenical Patriarchate is interesting as coming from a Bulgarian. He makes clear the distinction between Western and Eastern monasticism: the former is a great organization, like an army, at the disposal of the Pope for the conquest of the world; the latter is simply one of many possible ways of seeking perfection. We should have liked more information on Orthodox Missions, which are only mentioned in a footnote on page 124; the great Russian Missions in Siberia and Japan are too little known in the West. In his closing sentence the author attributes the saying "in necessariis unitas," etc., to an ancient Father; but it cannot be traced beyond a Protestant writer of the seventeenth century.

Dr. Zankov, like many Continental writers, classes the Anglican Communion among Protestants (p. 140). Impartial authorities, from Khomiakov to Charles Beard, the Unitarian, have recognized that the English Reformation had a different basis from that of the Continent; and English Synods have twice rejected the word "Protestant," expressly on the ground that the English Church must not be confused with the followers of Luther and Calvin. As was recognized by Dr. Monod at Lausanne, the Anglican Communion is neither Roman, Eastern, nor Protestant, but ranks as a fourth group.

Apart from this there is scarcely anything in this book which is not in agreement with the official teaching of the Anglican Churches, and it fills us with renewed hope for the future of the Anglican-Orthodox *entente*.

L'Eglise Russe is a short historical sketch of the Russian Church from a Roman Catholic standpoint. The Revolution, with all that has followed it, is not mentioned at all. We feel bound to call attention to the author's treatment of the remarkable career of Bishop Meletius Smotritzky (p. 106), whom he calls "un sage, si ce n'est un saint." In 1627 this Orthodox Prelate joined the Uniate Church, specially requesting that his conversion might be kept secret, in order that he might be able to proselytize more easily! He did not make public his submission to Rome till six years later, shortly before his death. Yet M. Brian-Chaninov shows no disapproval of Smotritzky, though he does not spare his blame in other directions.

C. BEAUFORT MOSS.

INSTRUCTIONS ON THE RELIGIOUS LIFE. By Richard Meux Benson.
Oxford: Society of St. John the Evangelist. 1s. 6d.

This is a small book of less than seventy pages, but full of food for thought on the part not only of Religious, but of all priests, and indeed all Christians. It consists of notes of twenty instructions given in 1870 by Fr. Benson to the society which he founded. Its present Superior speaks in the Preface of the qualities which these instructions show: "clear vision, intense devotion, fine moderation, uncompromising faith." The instructions are on the Religious Life, its Rule, the Three Vows, and their object (1-15); on the Principle of Mortification, the Life of Prayer, Silence, Recollectedness, Sacrifice (16-20). It is impossible to read them without being deeply impressed and humbled; and we are glad to note that Fr. Bull looks forward to the publication of a further series. We cannot have too much of Fr. Benson; the Church's debt to him is still too little understood.

E. GRAHAM.

ARCHBISHOP DAVIDSON AND THE ENGLISH CHURCH. By Sidney Dark.
Philip Allan and Co., and S.S.P.P. 8s. 6d.

The Archbishop's greatness has impressed Mr. Dark, and he has not hesitated to declare it unreservedly. Referring to a long personal talk which he had with him, he writes: "I thought then, and I think now, that he is the greatest man with whom I have ever talked." In this book he pictures Dr. Davidson moving "from strength to strength, from palace to palace," with unconcealed admiration for the outstanding goodness and strength of one who constantly and strenuously strove to promote the best interests of his Church and nation, unspoiled by the many marks

of favour that were bestowed upon him from the early years of his ministry, and undaunted by persistent threatenings of failure in health.

But Mr. Dark's view of the Church and its mission is not that of the late Archbishop of Canterbury, and the honest recognition of his greatness is accompanied by equally outspoken criticism and suggestion of failure in more than one matter. There is a complaint that he lacked audacity—Apostolic audacity—and that his ideal of comprehensiveness was misconceived. Though his sympathies grew, they remained imperfect; he trusted overmuch to negotiation and compromise, and he sought to check movements within the Church by astutely yielding to them up to a fixed point, in the hope of securing agreement that there would be no progress beyond that point.

All this is written in excellent taste, with perhaps the single exception of a lapse in which the lot of the then Bishop of Winchester is rather bitterly contrasted with that of Father Dolling, and it constitutes fair criticism which will commend itself to those who think as Mr. Dark does about Anglo-Catholicism. No one knows better than the author, however, that there are other points of view and other estimates of the value of the Archbishop's work. Time alone will show which of them is true. The big and authoritative book on Dr. Davidson's place in the history of our Church and people cannot yet be written. But here, meanwhile, is an entertaining memoir which will help its readers to think with increased respect and reverence of a good man and a great public servant, and will at the same time promote intelligent reflection on the situation in which the Church of England finds itself today.

O. HARDMAN.

THE CHURCH: PAPERS FROM THE SUMMER SCHOOL OF CATHOLIC STUDIES
HELD AT CAMBRIDGE, AUGUST 6-15, 1927. Edited by C. Lattey, S.J.
Heffer. 7s. 6d.

This collection of papers makes up a book which is both learned and readable, even though in the nature of the case it is bound to contain a certain amount of special pleading. For indeed the Ultramontane theory of the Church is not an easy one to uphold. It involves the assumption that though revelation ceased when the last book of the Bible was written, yet the Pope, when defining doctrine, is infallible "in his own right and of his own authority." How wide is the content of the term "doctrine" may be seen from the fact that apparently St. Peter's alleged Roman Episcopate and Leo XIII.'s condemnation of Anglican Orders both fall within its scope.

Fr. Martindale's paper on the New Testament probably had to suffer from compression. He gives us the Papalist interpretation of our Lord's promise to St. Peter without any hint that there are others, and links with it the parable of the house built on a rock without pointing out that *this* rock means obedience to the moral teaching of our Lord, and cannot by any possibility be made to cover any theory of Church government. It seems strange to any outsider that anyone should find the Council at Jerusalem containing "conclusive" evidence for the Petrine supremacy, even with the help of picturesque corroborative details like that of Paul and Barnabas being "kept waiting in the ante-room." Nor is it easy for the ordinary reader to find in St. Peter's First Epistle the Papal tone

which Fr. Martindale detects in it. (And the Petrine claim to Paul's handkerchief* is surely a new one!)

Dr. Rhodes' paper on the Ante-Nicene Fathers is extraordinarily able. Yet it is hard to take quite seriously a sentence like the following, which supposes the case of an Ante-Nicene Catholic faced with the definition of Papal Infallibility: "He might have been astonished at what would be an unheard-of way of putting it, but after having the meaning clearly explained to him, would have agreed that it expressed, in an apparently paradoxical way, what he himself believed." Surely there is a certain hardihood about this. Further, in view of the reader's remarks about St. Cyprian's canonization, it is really necessary to remember that the canonized president of the Second General Council appears to have died out of communion with the See of Rome.

Fr. Byrne, writing of developments under St. Leo I. and St. Gregory I., boldly maintains that in the sense of "changes" there are none to be found.

One cannot help wishing that Fr. Grimley had not allowed himself to speak of the holy Church of Russia as "probably defunct." Nor is it really convincing to say that "the Roman Church . . . has faced the brunt of the attack on Christianity in the intellectual sphere during the past two centuries, and come through unscathed." To many people one of the great difficulties about the Roman Catholic position is the obscurantism to which the Holy See seems to have so often committed itself. But, indeed, Dr. Grimley will have nothing of the appeal to history. "All that is necessary is to find the legitimate teaching body. . . . The use of historical evidence to supplant the clear teaching of the legitimate *hic et nunc* teaching body is religious topsy-turvydom." There follows a rather remarkable *petitio principii*. "The one Church which can boast that its origin is not due to a break with the past is the Catholic Church."

The most noticeable point in Dr. Geddes' paper on jurisdiction is the contention that excommunication does not destroy membership in the Church. It will be remembered that this position, assumed by the Anglican Bishops in their Appeal to all Christian People after the last Lambeth Conference, was subjected to severe criticism by Dr. Stone and Fr. Puller as being contrary to Patristic teaching. It appears, however, that since the issue of the new *Corpus Juris Canonici* the dominant opinion among Roman Catholic theologians has been that the baptismal character and membership in the Church are synonymous. Indeed, it is obvious that it is only on such a theory that a justification could be offered for the transactions of the Inquisition.

K. D. MACKENZIE.

* Page 43; cf. Acts xix. 11, 12.

*An Appeal to those of the
English Church who love
Our Lord and the Catholic
Religion, and will seek Him
in His Children*

THE HOLY FAMILY HOMES

Little Families—NOT Institutions
—of youngsters from poor homes,
no homes, or otherwise destitute—
with **LOVE** to guide and guard
them, and the Faith to sustain them

*Literature and all particulars from the Secretary and Treasurer, Rev. G. H. Burnett,
Holy Family Homes, Church House, Dean's Yard, Westminster, S.W. 1*

LONGMANS

THE PHILOSOPHY OF PLOTINUS

The Gifford Lectures at St. Andrews, 1917-1918

By the Very Rev. W. R. INGE, C.V.O., D.D., Dean of St. Paul's.
Two Volumes. Third Edition, thoroughly revised. 8vo. 21s. net.

THE IDEAS OF THE FALL AND OF ORIGINAL SIN

A Historical and Critical Study. The Bampton Lectures for 1924

By the Rev. N. P. WILLIAMS, D.D. 8vo. 21s. net.

THE NEW TESTAMENT DOCTRINE OF THE CHRIST

The Bampton Lectures for 1926

By the Rev. A. E. J. RAWLINSON, D.D. 8vo. 12s. 6d. net.

CONSCIENCE AND ITS PROBLEMS:

An Introduction to Casuistry

By the Rev. KENNETH E. KIRK, M.A., D.D. (Oxon). 8vo. 16s. net.

SOME PRINCIPLES OF MORAL THEOLOGY AND THEIR APPLICATION

By the Rev. KENNETH E. KIRK, M.A., D.D. (Oxon). 8vo. 15s. net.

Longmans, Green & Co., Ltd., 39 Paternoster Row, London, E.C.4

New S.P.C.K. Books

JESUS—JESHUA

Studies in the Gospels by GUSTAF DALMAN, D.D. Authorised translation by the Rev. PAUL P. LEVERTOFF. Cloth boards. 15s. net.

(Ready in June.)

Professor Dalman is known to readers of English by his "The Words of Jesus," which is indispensable to serious students of the Gospels. Since that book appeared, his knowledge of Aramaic and of Palestine has deepened each year. He now offers in an English dress this great book in which he examines the problem, summed up in the title, of the thoughts of Our Lord, expressed in Aramaic, but reaching us in a Greek dress. Every light thrown on such a problem is welcome. How precious, then, is the illumination given by the scholar who is probably the greatest living authority on the Aramaic spoken by Our Lord, and is alive at every turn to the religious values of the problems discussed.

A CRITICAL & EXEGETICAL COMMENTARY ON THE BOOK OF AMOS

The Text of the Revised Version edited with Introduction, Notes, and Excursuses by RICHARD S. CRIPPS, M.A., St. John's College, Cambridge, with a Foreword by CANON R. H. KENNETT, D.D., Regius Professor of Hebrew in the University of Cambridge. Cloth boards. 15s. net.

(Ready in June.)

The Book of Amos, the earliest book of the Old Testament which has come down to us substantially as uttered by the author, has naturally been the point upon which research has been focussed during recent years. A host of problems of great importance to the student of Religion are best approached by way of Amos. No book has been published in English for many years dealing adequately with these problems. The present work is designed both for the specialist, who is given information of great value, and for the minister of Religion, in that it keeps in mind throughout the practical needs of humanity.

THE BISHOP'S REGISTER

A translation of documents from medieval episcopal registers designed to illustrate the contents of such registers as well as various phases of medieval episcopal activity. With Introduction and Notes by C. J. OFFER, M.A. Cloth boards. 12s. 6d. net.

This book is designed for the general historical student rather than for the technical scholar. Its aim is to give a conspectus of the activity of the medieval English bishop, in the words of his official documents, translated into literal English. The bishop appears directing religious houses, dealing with clergy and laity, heresy, church building, and the ordinary life of the times.

SEEKERS AND SAINTS

Studies of Religious Experience. By the Rev. W. J. FERRAR. Cloth boards. 6s. net.

(Ready in May.)

The reader is here conducted through a gallery in which hang sketches of great personalities of East and West, Christian and Pagan times. The dominant note throughout the book is the power of the spiritual values in human lives, which render their possessors a kind of leaven or salt in society.

S.P.C.K., Northumberland Avenue, London, W.C.

New S.P.C.K. Books

A HISTORY OF CHRISTIAN MISSIONS IN CHINA

By KENNETH SCOTT LATOURETTE, D. Willis James Professor of Missions and Oriental History in Yale University. With a map. Cloth boards, 18s. net.

The full and complete history of Christianity in China has never been told before.

"A History of Christian Missions in China" takes an objective—although in the main sympathetic—point of view of Christian missions considered as one of the most important phases of the impact of Western civilisation upon China. Careful study is also given to the interactions continually in process between political, economic, and religious trends in China, especially at the present time.

TEMPLE GAIRDNER OF CAIRO

By CONSTANCE E. PADWICK. With photogravure frontispiece and several illustrations. Cloth boards, 7s. 6d. net. *(Ready in May.)*

The S.P.C.K. is generally modest in its claims. In the present case it calls attention to what it believes to be the finest religious biography for many years. Hidden away in Cairo from the gaze of the world was a great man—great in heart and mind and soul, a living embodiment of the Franciscan spirit. Canon Gairdner was a C.M.S. missionary to Moslems, but when this book becomes known his praise will be in all the churches.

THE OLD CHURCH IN THE NEW DOMINION

The Story of the Anglican Church in Canada. By C. W. VERNON, M.A., B.D., D.C.L. With numerous illustrations. Paper cover, 2s. 6d.; cloth boards, 4s. 6d. net.

A plain, accurate history crammed with facts, largely unknown in England, of the origin and progress of the Canadian Church.

A PIONEER OF PAPUA

Being the life of the Rev. Copland King, M.A., one of the two first missionaries of the New Guinea Mission. By the Rt. Rev. BISHOP GILBERT WHITE, D.D. With numerous illustrations. Duxeen boards, 2s. 6d. net. *(Ready in May.)*

A PADRE IN PARAGUAY

By C. E. NEWBOULD. With 16 illustrations. Cloth boards, 6s. net. *(Ready in May.)*

While Argentine and Brazil are mentioned in this book, Paraguay is its main theme. Here we read an account written by one whose life has been largely spent among the scenes he describes. South American manners, revolutions, primitive Indians, mining camps, and perhaps most interesting of all, the famous communistic settlement of New Australia are the subject of this book.

SOCIETY FOR PROMOTING CHRISTIAN KNOWLEDGE

LONDON: Northumberland Avenue, W.C. 2 43, Queen Victoria Street, E.C. 4
BRIGHTON: 61, Preston Street BATH: 39, Gay Street

And of all Booksellers. Lists post free.

ENGLISH CHURCH UNION

THE ENGLISH CHURCH UNION still maintains the unique position which it has occupied for seventy years in the Catholic Movement.

It devotes its enormous resources to the steadfast defence of Catholic Doctrine and Discipline, and persists in upholding the claim of the Church of England to be an integral part of the whole Catholic Church of Christ.

It has devoted itself, through its Literature Committee, to the production of literature in all branches of Theology and Ethics, including the admirable One Volume Catholic Commentary on the whole Bible (S.P.C.K. 16s.) and the Second Edition of "The Catechism of Catholic Faith and Practice" (S.P.C.K., 2d.).

The Union, through its Legal Committee and by means of its great financial resources, is able to afford counsel, protection and assistance to all persons, lay or clerical, who may be oppressed in any spiritual matter.

In all its activities the Union seeks to co-operate with all other Catholic Societies, and looks forward hopefully to the day when all such Societies may be united and work together under one leadership for the support of Catholic Principles and Practice.

Conditions of Membership : Membership is open to all members of the Church of England and of Churches in Communion with her who are communicants, and the membership is graduated as follows : Full Members, 10/- a year ; Associates, 2/6 ; and Adherents, 1/-.

The Church Union Gazette is published monthly at the incredibly low price of 1/6 per annum, post free.

ARNOLD PINCHARD,

Secretary.

31, Russell Square, W.C. 1.